



ATTORNEY PARTNERSHIP

# AI Governance in Practice

Opportunities, Risks and Lessons from Practice

Görkem Gökçe

Managing Partner, Gökçe  
Attorney Partnership

Presentation and Q&A · 60  
minutes



**Görkem Gökçe**

Managing Partner, Gökçe Attorney  
Partnership

## The Speaker

Görkem founded Gökçe in 2010 after starting his career as an associate at Dentons. He advises on cross-border M&A, joint ventures, private equity and venture capital, project finance and privatisations, with a particular focus on technology and digital businesses. He is also a frequent representative of clients in commercial disputes. Görkem has lectured on administrative law at the Istanbul Bar Association Training Center since 2009 and is a regular speaker at Turkish law schools.

Leads the firm's innovation and responsible AI agenda at Türkiye's first AI-integrated law firm

Panelist at the Microsoft AI Legal Summit; host of FUTURE READY: Legal Technology in Action; Founding Chairman, Turkish Internet & Technology Law Association

# Agenda

01

## The AI Landscape for Law Firms

Opportunities, risks and the client perspective

02

## In-House Counsel vs. Law Firms

How adoption habits and priorities differ

03

## Gökçe's AI Journey

From internal adoption to governance and accountability

04

## Practical Use Cases

Legislative monitoring, client alerts and document workflows

Q&A and closing

Questions from LNA members · last 10 minutes

01

# The AI Landscape for Law Firms

Opportunities, risks and the client perspective

# Opportunities and Risks

## Opportunities

|                                                                |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|
| Research and drafting speed on routine work                    |
| Legislative monitoring at a scale a team cannot match manually |
| Consistent work product through standardised prompts           |
| New client-facing services built on faster turnaround          |

## Risks to manage

|                                                     |
|-----------------------------------------------------|
| Confidentiality and privilege in third-party tools  |
| Accuracy: unreviewed output is not legal work       |
| Unclear accountability when AI touches client work  |
| Shadow use: lawyers adopting tools without a policy |

# The Client Perspective

Clients are themselves navigating AI adoption, compliance and operational change, and their expectations of outside counsel are changing with them.

**They ask how their matters are handled**

AI use on client work is becoming a due-diligence question

**They expect efficiency to reach them**

Faster monitoring, faster alerts, faster first drafts

**They reward visible governance**

Certification makes responsible adoption demonstrable, not declared

02

# In-House Counsel vs. Law Firms

How AI adoption habits and priorities differ

# Adoption Priorities: Convergence and Divergence

## In-house legal teams

|                                     |
|-------------------------------------|
| Volume: contracts, intake, triage   |
| Integration with business systems   |
| Cost pressure drives adoption speed |

## Law firms

|                                           |
|-------------------------------------------|
| Work-product quality and privilege        |
| Client-facing accountability for output   |
| Adoption shaped by matter confidentiality |

### Where they converge

Governance frameworks, vendor diligence, training, and understanding this gap is becoming part of good client service

# Observations from the Field

PANELIST · 9 JUNE 2026

## Microsoft AI Legal Summit

“Artificial Intelligence as a Tool: Perspectives on Complexity, Risk and Time Management”

HOST AND PANELIST · 30 JULY 2026

## FUTURE READY: Legal Technology in Action

AI strategies in legal departments, with in-house counsel and legal-tech founders

### The most common gaps, in both rooms

AI used for single tasks, never embedded into the workflow around them

No automation: every AI step still started and finished by hand

Safeguards such as data minimisation overlooked in day-to-day use

No AI in firms’ CRM, anticipating client needs or business development

*“I see a tremendous amount of work still to be done in this area. More law firms should have the courage to embrace it.”*

Görkem Gökçe, Microsoft AI Legal Summit

03

# Gökçe's AI Journey

From internal adoption to governance and accountability

# From Experimentation to Governance



Each stage answered a question the previous one raised: what works, how we use it, who is responsible, and how we prove it.

# Governance Without a Binding AI Law

## EU AI ACT

### Closer than establishment suggests

The Act does not catch us by establishment, but Article 2(1)(c) reaches third-country deployers where the AI output is used in the Union.

For work we do for EU clients, we treat that as the operating assumption rather than a question to litigate later.

---

Digital Omnibus Package (Regulation (EU) 2026/1744 of 8 July 2026): Annex III high-risk obligations deferred to 2 December 2027, Annex I to 2 August 2028.

## TÜRKİYE

### No statute, but no vacuum

**TBB advisory guide · 28 August 2026: four risk tiers**, from free general research to prohibited uses; we apply it internally as our policy baseline

**Three AI bills before parliament** since June 2024: risk-based, deepfake-focused and transparency-labelling approaches; none enacted

**2026-2030 National AI Action Plan** · gazetted 19 August 2026: tasks public bodies, no private-sector obligations yet

*No binding statute yet, but three bills before parliament, a national action plan in the Official Gazette three weeks ago, and bar guidance published two weeks ago. The direction is set; only the timing is open.*

# Lessons from Certification

01

## Governance is the work, not the tooling

The assessment examined responsibility and process, not which model we license

02

## Documentation forces clarity

Writing the policy exposed gaps that informal practice had hidden

03

## Adoption follows training, not mandates

Standards stick when lawyers see them make their own work better

04

## Certification speaks to clients

An external standard turns “we use AI responsibly” into something verifiable

04

# Practical Use Cases

Legislative monitoring, client alerts and document workflows

# Legislative Monitoring and Client Alerts

A daily pipeline, shown schematically: every output is lawyer-reviewed before it leaves the firm.



# Client Inventory and Standardised Prompts

Two internal building blocks that make the workflows repeatable

## Structured client inventory

Clients mapped to sector clusters and regulatory patterns they follow.

Cluster: fintech

Cluster: e-commerce

Pattern: KVKK enforcement

Pattern: employment tech

A new development maps to the affected clients in one step.

## Standardised prompts

Recurring tasks (screening, summarising, first drafts) run on firm-approved prompt standards, our working “reflexes”.

Same task, same structure, any lawyer

House style and disclaimers built in

Quality stops depending on who runs the task.

# Cross-Border Referrals and AI

In a network built on referrals, AI governance travels with the file: three questions we should be able to answer for each other

01

Which tools may receive our client's data once a matter is referred, and does the referral letter say so?

02

Does relying on a member firm's AI governance discharge our own confidentiality duty, or must we ask separately?

03

Should engagement letters carry a mutual AI-use clause, a shared LNA minimum text as a concrete benefit of this network?

*If we refer each other work, we inherit each other's AI governance. That is worth a shared minimum standard at network level, and I would rather we write it than have a client write it for us.*

# You Do Not Need a Certification to Start

The minimum viable version of every building block: four steps, no budget required

01

## One page of policy

What may reach a tool, what may not, who reviews

02

## One spreadsheet

Clients mapped to the regulatory patterns they follow

03

## Five prompts

The ones you actually reuse, written down once

04

## A name on every output

The reviewing lawyer's name goes on what leaves the firm

*We did those four first; the certification only audited them.*

# Q&A

Questions from LNA members, and an exchange of practical experiences on responsible, efficient and client-oriented AI adoption.

## CONTACT

[info@gokce.av.tr](mailto:info@gokce.av.tr)

## WEB

[gokce.av.tr](http://gokce.av.tr)

## SPEAKER

Görkem Gökçe, Managing Partner