Responsible Integration of AI in Public Legal Education: Regulatory Challenges and Opportunities in Albania

Adrian LEKA
"Luigj Gurakuqi" University of Shkodër
Shkoder, Albania

Brunilda HAXHIU
University of New York Tirana
Tirana, Albania

ABSTRACT

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is being used increasingly worldwide to provide better legal education to the public by providing them with easily accessible and automated legal information. However, its integration into justice systems raises significant legal, ethical, and policy concerns. In Albania, where legal literacy remains low despite ongoing judicial reforms, AI-driven tools present both an opportunity and a challenge. This study explores the legal and regulatory implications of incorporating AI into public legal education, analyzing potential risks related to misinformation, algorithmic bias, data privacy, and human rights compliance.

Using a doctrinal legal research approach, the study examines Albania's existing legal framework, including constitutional provisions on access to justice, data protection laws, and the justice reform strategy and subsequent legislation. This is followed by a comparative legal analysis of AI-driven legal education initiatives in Estonia, the United Kingdom, Canada, and Singapore. This analysis provides insights into regulatory best practices. Furthermore, the study evaluates AI's alignment with international human rights norms, particularly the right to legal information under UN Sustainable Development Goal 16.

The findings of this study reveal the existing gaps in Albania's legal system regarding AI-driven legal education and emphasize the need for including strong legal protections. The study proposes policy recommendations aiming at the usage of AI tools to enhance public legal literacy while maintaining legal accuracy, transparency, and accountability. These recommendations include AI oversight mechanisms, legal accuracy standards, and ethical AI guidelines that are tailored to Albania's socio-political context. The responsible integration of AI capabilities into legal education can help Albania improve public trust in its justice system and strengthen democratic participation.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence (AI), Legal Education, Access to Justice, Albania

1. INTRODUCTION

AI technology has grown rapidly and affected many areas, including healthcare [6], finance [35], and education [32]. The legal field is also changing, especially in how legal knowledge reaches the public. AI platforms like chatbots and automated information systems are being used worldwide to improve public legal literacy by providing easy-to-understand legal information [1, 12, 20].[1] These technologies can make justice more accessible to everyone, particularly in countries where access is limited due to structural or economic barriers.

However, using AI in justice systems creates legal, ethical, and policy challenges. Major concerns include the spread of false information, unfair algorithmic decisions, privacy violations, and potential conflicts with human rights standards. The growing use of AI tools for public legal information has raised questions about their accuracy, transparency, and compliance with constitutional and international standards [7, 24, 31]. These issues are particularly important in transitional countries like Albania, where justice reforms have not significantly improved legal literacy and public trust in the judiciary remains low.

This study examines how AI technologies might be integrated into public legal education in Albania. It uses a legal research approach to analyze Albania's constitutional and legal provisions regarding access to justice, data protection, and judicial reform strategies. The study also compares how other countries have regulated AI in legal education initiatives. This comparison helps identify best practices in this area.

Beyond domestic and comparative analysis, the paper evaluates AI-driven legal education against international human rights standards, particularly UN Sustainable Development Goal 16, which promotes equal access to justice and legal information. The paper argues that while AI offers significant opportunities to improve legal awareness and strengthen democratic participation in Albania, its use must be guided by strong regulations that ensure accuracy, accountability, and rights protection. The study ends with policy recommendations for responsibly integrating AI into Albania's public legal education system.

2. CONCEPTUAL FOUNDATIONS

At the start of this research, it is important to define what Artificial Intelligence (AI) means in public legal education. AI refers to computer systems that can perform tasks that usually require human intelligence, such as reasoning, learning, and making decisions. In legal education, AI is commonly used as natural language processing (NLP) chatbots, automated legal

---

[1] Chatbots like DoNotPay (U.S./U.K.) and Rechtwijzer (Netherlands) and tools like LawHelp Interactive (USA) and India's Supreme Court Vidhik Anuvaad Software (SUVAS).

information platforms, decision-support tools, and machine learning systems trained on legal texts [10].

These tools are designed primarily to share legal information with the public through basic explanations of legal rights and procedures. AI systems used for legal education are different from judicial AI tools because they provide information rather than make legal decisions. It is important to distinguish between legal information and legal advice. Legal information can be shared broadly and made accessible, while legal advice must be personalized and requires qualified professionals.

AI tools show great potential in many areas, but they are limited by the quality of their training data [21] and the biases built in by their developers [9]. This creates both opportunities and risks, especially in transitional legal systems like Albania's, where regulatory oversight and public trust are still developing.

Legal literacy means the ability of people to understand, evaluate, and use legal information in their daily lives [16]. It is essential for effective access to justice [19]. A legally literate population is more likely to recognize when their rights are violated, seek legal help, and engage with justice institutions. Many countries have included legal literacy programs in their justice reform strategies.

International law also recognizes the right to legal information as a key part of the rule of law. Article 19 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) [8] and General Comment No. 34 from the UN Human Rights Committee [25] confirm that access to legal and public interest information is central to civil liberties. Similarly, Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 16, especially target 16.3 [29], calls for equal access to justice for all and requires inclusive, accessible, and accurate legal information systems [14].

In Albania, where justice reforms aim to restore public trust in justice institutions, improving legal literacy is a key governance goal. However, using AI to provide such education must be done carefully to prevent citizens from relying on flawed or incomplete AI-generated information and mistaking it for authoritative legal guidance.

3. THE ALBANIAN CONTEXT

Albania is a country undergoing legal and institutional change, having started a comprehensive justice reform process in 2016. This reform began in response to ongoing problems such as widespread corruption, inefficient courts, and deep public distrust in legal institutions [5]. The main goals include increasing transparency, restoring judicial independence, and improving access to justice. The reform has introduced important structural and legal changes, but public legal literacy remains low [28]. This gap continues to weaken efforts to democratize legal processes, encourage civic participation, and ensure that citizens can effectively access and use the justice system.

Albania's Constitution guarantees basic rights to legal remedies and information. Article 42 ensures the right to a fair legal process, while Article 23 guarantees access to public information. These provisions create a constitutional foundation for expanding public legal education. However, implementing these rights through AI systems raises new legal challenges that Albania's current legal framework does not fully address.

In data protection, Albania has adopted a new Law on the Protection of Personal Data (Law No. 124/2024), which fully implements the EU's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and the EU's LED Directive. This law requires data controllers and processors to ensure transparency, informed consent, and protection of sensitive information, and also creates a basic legal foundation for AI systems in general. However, AI systems used in legal education often process user questions and data without clear regulatory guidance, creating potential privacy violations [22].

While Albania's use of AI is still in early stages, there is growing interest in using digital technologies to expand access to justice and government services. Pilot programs in e-governance tools (e.g., e-Albania) [23] show a willingness to modernize public services. At the same time, Albania's justice reform strategic document and action plan [11], and related legislative initiatives included provisions for improving digital services in the judiciary. These reforms prioritize digital transformation and citizen engagement, but they do not specifically address AI governance, particularly for educational tools aimed at the public. Additionally, AI-specific initiatives in the legal sector are still limited, with no publicly documented projects focused solely on public legal education. As a result, Albania lacks a clear framework for evaluating the accuracy, fairness, and transparency of AI-driven legal information platforms.

This digital gap results from several factors. Albania still has low digital literacy rates in rural and marginalized communities. Additionally, the absence of a national AI strategy creates uncertainty about future regulatory directions, although Albania has already implemented relevant EU law on data protection and cybersecurity. This legal gap makes it difficult to assess how emerging AI tools might be held accountable or safely integrated into public education platforms.

Given this situation, integrating AI into Albania's legal education programs presents the challenge of introducing technological innovation while protecting fundamental rights. Therefore, any future framework must consider both technical innovation and Albania's unique social, political, and legal conditions.

4. LEGAL AND ETHICAL CONCERNS OF AI IN LEGAL EDUCATION

AI offers significant opportunities for improving access to legal information. However, its use in public legal education raises several legal and ethical concerns. These concerns are particularly important in transitional democracies like Albania, where institutions are still being strengthened and public trust in justice institutions is fragile. This section examines the main risks of using AI in legal education: misinformation, algorithmic bias, data privacy, and human rights compliance.

One of the biggest risks of using AI tools in legal education is spreading inaccurate, outdated, or misleading legal information. Unlike static legal databases, AI systems, especially those using generative language models, work with training data that may not be updated in real time or may generalize legal content in ways that distort legal meanings [10]. For example, a chatbot might oversimplify legal concepts, leave out important details for a specific jurisdiction or case type, or fail to adapt information to the user's particular legal situation.

Another concern about using AI tools in public legal education is that these tools, especially chatbots or interactive platforms, often process personal data. Even when their stated purpose is purely informational, these tools still collect metadata, query histories, or locations to personalize responses or improve system performance. Such data practices fall under Albania's Law No. 124/2024, which includes provisions regulating automated decision-making and profiling. Specifically, Article 20 prohibits decisions that have legal or significant personal consequences when made solely through automated processing, including profiling, unless explicitly authorized by law or based on informed user consent. Where permitted, these practices must include safeguards such as human oversight, the right to obtain human intervention, and the ability to contest decisions.

These requirements are especially important for legal education tools such as chatbots or virtual assistants that simulate legal interaction. In Albania's context, where digital legal awareness remains underdeveloped, such safeguards are essential to ensure that AI systems do not function as legal advisors or undermine individuals' access to justice. Any future deployment of AI in this area must therefore include human-in-the-loop safeguards and prominently displayed disclaimers clarifying the system's limitations.

Another risk with AI tools is algorithmic bias. AI systems' responses depend on the data they are trained on and the design choices made by their developers [9, 21]. Algorithmic bias occurs when AI systems reflect or increase existing social and legal inequalities that disadvantage certain groups, leading to discriminatory responses [36]. For example, if an AI tool is trained on case law from urban areas or does not include many gender-related cases, it may give responses that are irrelevant or unfair to rural populations or women.

In Albania, where social inequality and digital exclusion are ongoing issues, algorithmic bias in legal education tools could worsen the marginalization of vulnerable groups and further reduce trust in justice institutions. However, domestic law does not currently require bias audits or fairness evaluations for AI systems. This leaves users exposed to structural discrimination without institutional recourse or transparency mechanisms.

Nevertheless, Law No. 124/2024 does provide important protections against profiling and discrimination. Article 2(19) defines profiling as the automated processing of personal data to assess individual behavior, preferences, or legal needs, which are common functions in AI-enhanced legal education platforms. Article 53 explicitly prohibits profiling that results in discriminatory outcomes, particularly when based on sensitive characteristics such as race, ethnicity, political affiliation, or socioeconomic status. These provisions confirm Albania's legal commitment to preventing systemic bias. In practical terms, this means that AI tools must be developed and audited to avoid disproportionately disadvantaging marginalized groups. Developers must also ensure that training datasets and logic models do not embed the social biases present in Albania's legal or demographic history. Without bias audits, fairness assessments, and explainability protocols, AI tools risk perpetuating the very injustices they are designed to address.

Beyond bias, the security and ethical use of personal data is another fundamental concern. Articles 28 and 66 of the data protection law require that both public and private entities using AI tools implement strong technical safeguards, such as encryption, access controls, and real-time monitoring. Additionally, Articles 7, 20, and 54 require explicit and informed consent before any personal data is collected, processed, or analyzed by automated systems. These provisions directly apply to AI-powered legal education platforms, which must communicate how user data is handled and offer opt-out options. In a legal education context, where trust and transparency are critical, failing to secure informed consent or protect personal data undermines both legal compliance and public legitimacy. Accordingly, all future AI systems used in public legal education must adopt a privacy-by-design architecture and ensure that consent mechanisms are accessible, multilingual, and culturally appropriate.

Finally, Articles 49 and 66 require Data Protection Impact Assessments (DPIAs) for systems that involve high-risk processing, including AI tools in justice-related applications. These assessments are intended to evaluate the potential effects of automated systems on fundamental rights and freedoms before deployment. The law also empowers the Commissioner for the Right to Information and Personal Data Protection to provide oversight, issue guidelines, and enforce corrective actions. For Albania, this offers a legal infrastructure for monitoring high-risk AI use, but its effectiveness depends on creating AI-specific DPIA templates, adequate institutional capacity, and inter-agency coordination. Incorporating these impact assessments into national AI strategies for the justice sector will be crucial for ensuring that such systems are legally compliant, ethically sound, and socially legitimate.

Ultimately, public legal education is a component of the broader right to access justice and information, recognized in both Albanian constitutional law and international human rights frameworks. Any AI system that undermines this right through inaccuracy, vagueness, or bias risks violating fundamental legal protections. International principles such as the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, the OECD AI Principles, and the Council of Europe's Framework Convention on AI all emphasize the necessity of transparency, accountability, and human oversight in AI systems, particularly those affecting legal rights.

However, Albania has yet to integrate these international standards into a national regulatory framework specific to AI. Without such alignment, the deployment of AI tools in legal education risks violating key obligations under SDG 16.3 (access to justice for all) and Article 6 of the ECHR (right to a fair trial). As such, the development and regulation of legal AI in Albania must be guided by a dual imperative: to use technological innovation while safeguarding human rights and legal integrity.

In summary, while AI can support broader access to legal information in Albania, its use must be approached with caution, regulation, and ethical foresight. Without proper legal safeguards, institutional oversight, and rights-based design principles, AI systems could unintentionally reinforce exclusion and misinformation. The next section will explore how other jurisdictions have addressed these challenges and what regulatory lessons Albania can draw from their experiences.

5. COMPARATIVE LEGAL ANALYSIS

To evaluate the challenges and opportunities of integrating AI into public legal education, this section conducts a comparative legal analysis of four jurisdictions that have pioneered digital legal information systems: Estonia, the United Kingdom, Canada, and Singapore. Each of these countries presents a different model for regulating AI in ways that promote legal accuracy, accountability, and public trust. By comparing these experiences with Albania's legal framework, this section identifies best practices that can inform Albania's emerging regulatory approach.

A. Estonia

Estonia is widely recognized as a global leader in digital governance [18, 34], including the modernization of its justice system [33]. The country has developed sophisticated AI tools to enhance public access to legal information, most notably the virtual assistant Suve, which provides users with streamlined legal and administrative guidance [3]. A key feature of Estonia's approach is its national AI strategy, KrattAI, which establishes principles such as human oversight, algorithmic transparency, and the public interest as fundamental to all AI deployments [2]. The use of transparent algorithm registers makes government-operated AI systems visible and accountable, while centralized legal information portals are integrated with real-time databases, improving accessibility and legal certainty for the general public [4]. At the same time, Estonia maintains a strong data protection regime aligned with the EU General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), ensuring that personal data processed through AI tools is adequately protected [13]. For Albania, Estonia's model shows how digital legal technologies can be deployed effectively and ethically when embedded within a coherent governance structure that prioritizes transparency, coordination, and data protection.

B. The United Kingdom

The United Kingdom offers a cautious approach to AI integration in the legal sector, balancing technological innovation with regulatory safeguards. Public legal education in the UK is supported by widely used digital platforms such as Advicenow and Citizens Advice, which provide free, plain-language legal information on various topics. While these platforms do not rely exclusively on AI, they are increasingly integrating automation and interactive tools to enhance user experience. Importantly, the UK has developed a regulatory environment that encourages responsible experimentation with legal technologies. Institutions such as the Solicitors Regulation Authority (SRA) and the Law Society of England and Wales support the development of AI tools through regulatory sandboxes, allowing legal tech innovations to be tested under real-world conditions while remaining subject to oversight. Ethical standards have also been introduced to ensure that AI tools used in the legal domain maintain accuracy, fairness, and non-discrimination. Data protection and user consent are governed by the UK GDPR, which mirrors the European framework and provides clear rules on the collection, processing, and use of personal data. For Albania, the UK's experience demonstrates the value of a phased, supervised approach to legal AI deployment that enables innovation while ensuring that public tools maintain legal integrity, user trust, and accountability.

C. Canada

Canada adopts a rights-based and inclusive approach to using AI in public services, including the justice and legal education sectors. Public legal education is advanced through platforms such as Community Legal Education Ontario (CLEO), which provide accessible, plain-language resources to diverse communities. These platforms increasingly incorporate digital tools and automated systems to tailor content to specific user needs. At the federal level, Canada has introduced the Directive on Automated Decision-Making (2019), which establishes a tiered framework for using AI in government services. This directive requires the completion of Algorithmic Impact Assessments (AIAs), proportional to the potential risk posed by the system, and requires mechanisms such as human oversight, documentation of decision logic, and public transparency. Canada's emphasis on inclusion is reflected in its efforts to develop legal information tools that are accessible to Indigenous populations, immigrant communities, and low-income groups, ensuring that technology does not reinforce existing inequalities. At the same time, Canada's data protection regime reinforces strict standards for consent and data handling. For Albania, Canada's model demonstrates how a strong commitment to equity, human rights, and proactive risk assessment can guide the responsible integration of AI into public legal education.

D. Singapore

Singapore exemplifies a strategic and highly coordinated approach to AI governance, emphasizing both technological efficiency and regulatory control. As part of its Smart Nation initiative, the country has developed legal information systems such as LawNet and JustAsk, which use AI to assist users in retrieving case law, legal commentary, and administrative guidance. These tools operate within a governance framework that prioritizes trust and accountability, overseen by agencies such as the Infocomm Media Development Authority (IMDA) and the Personal Data Protection Commission (PDPC). Singapore has issued detailed Model AI Governance Frameworks, which promote principles of explainability, fairness, and human-centric design across all AI deployments. While its approach is more centralized and state-directed than in other jurisdictions, Singapore has made significant efforts to embed ethical considerations into AI policy through regular updates, consultation with stakeholders, and the implementation of technical standards. Data privacy is regulated under the Personal Data Protection Act (PDPA), which governs both private and public sector data use and requires organizations to obtain consent and safeguard personal data in AI applications. For Albania, Singapore's model offers insights into how strong institutional leadership, combined with clear ethical guidelines and technical standardization, can facilitate the safe and effective use of AI in legal education and public engagement.

6. INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS AND AI ALIGNMENTS

The integration of AI into public legal education must be evaluated not only through national and comparative legal perspectives but also within the framework of international human rights law. The right to access accurate and understandable legal information is a critical component of democratic governance, anchored in binding and normative instruments such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights

(UDHR), the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), and the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR). Albania, as a signatory to these instruments, has the legal obligation to ensure that AI-enhanced legal education advances rather than obstructs fundamental rights.

A. The Right to Legal Information and Access to Justice

The right to access legal information is established in Article 19 of the ICCPR, which guarantees the right to seek, receive, and impart information. This principle is further reinforced by General Comment No. 34, which emphasizes the state's duty to proactively share legal information, particularly where it affects the public's ability to understand and exercise their rights.

In the European context, Article 6 of the ECHR ensures the right to a fair trial, which implicitly includes knowledge of legal rights and remedies. The European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) has repeatedly confirmed that meaningful access to justice depends on the ability of individuals to understand their legal position and the procedures available to them [15, 17].

In this light, AI tools used in public legal education must:

- Provide accurate and non-misleading information,
- Be accessible to marginalized and vulnerable populations,
- Avoid reinforcing or replicating structural discrimination.

When these standards are not met, AI interventions may unintentionally violate Albania's positive obligations under international human rights law.

B. Sustainable Development Goal 16: Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions

The UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) provide a global framework for rights-based development. Specifically, Target 16.3 of SDG 16 calls for ensuring equal access to justice for all [14], which inherently includes access to legal education and information [27]. AI has the potential to serve as a powerful enabler of this goal, if deployed responsibly.

However, the United Nations High-Level Panel on Digital Cooperation [26] and UNESCO's Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence (30) both warn of the risks of using AI without due regard for transparency, accountability, and equity. They emphasize that digital tools used in legal and justice systems must be explainable, inclusive, and subject to independent oversight.

Albania, as a UN member state and participant in SDG monitoring, has made commitments to implement Goal 16. Yet, the lack of AI-specific rights safeguards in its current legal infrastructure could undermine its progress toward this target. Failure to mitigate risks such as biased outputs, data misuse, or misinformation may even widen the justice gap the country seeks to close.

C. Towards Rights-Aligned AI in Albania

Aligning AI use in legal education with human rights norms requires deliberate legal, institutional, and technical strategies. These include:

- Embedding human rights standards into AI procurement and development contracts,
- Requiring human-in-the-loop procedures for all AI-generated legal content,
- Developing explainability protocols to ensure users can understand how outputs are generated,
- Ensuring non-discrimination by including rural, minority, and gender-sensitive content in training datasets.

Furthermore, Albania should consider adopting or aligning with global instruments such as:

- Council of Europe's Framework Convention on AI, Rule of Law and Democracy (2024),
- OECD Principles on AI (2019),
- UNESCO's AI Ethics Recommendations (2021).

By embracing these frameworks, Albania can move from a technology-first to a rights-first approach in digital legal education, thereby strengthening its international commitments and improving citizen trust in both AI tools and justice institutions.

7. POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ALBANIA

Based on the comparative analysis and human rights framework examined in this study, Albania requires a comprehensive regulatory approach to responsibly integrate AI into public legal education. These policy recommendations address the key challenges identified while leveraging the opportunities presented by AI technologies.

Albania should begin by establishing a dedicated AI governance framework specifically designed for legal education applications. This framework must include the creation of an AI Ethics Committee within the Ministry of Justice to oversee AI deployments in legal education, ensuring compliance with both constitutional rights and international human rights standards. The government should also develop AI-specific guidelines that complement existing data protection laws, particularly Law No. 124/2024, with sector-specific requirements for legal information systems. Following Canada's example, Albania should establish mandatory algorithmic impact assessments for all AI tools used in public legal education to evaluate potential risks before deployment.

To address the critical issue of misinformation, Albania must implement strict legal accuracy and quality standards for AI systems. This requires mandatory human oversight for all AI-generated legal content, ensuring that qualified legal professionals review and validate information before it reaches the public. The country should follow Estonia's model by integrating AI tools with real-time legal databases, connecting them directly to authoritative sources including current legislation, case law, and regulatory updates. Clear disclaimer protocols must distinguish between legal information and legal advice, protecting users from inappropriately relying on AI outputs as authoritative legal guidance. Regular accuracy auditing conducted by independent legal experts should be established to identify and correct systematic errors or outdated information.

Given Albania's diverse population and ongoing digital divide, the government must prioritize addressing algorithmic bias and ensuring inclusive access. This requires mandatory bias audits for all AI systems used in legal education, with particular attention to rural populations, ethnic minorities, and gender-sensitive legal issues. Albania should develop multilingual capabilities ensuring AI tools operate effectively in Albanian and minority languages spoken within the country. Accessibility standards must accommodate users with disabilities and varying levels of digital literacy. The government should also establish representative training datasets that reflect Albania's demographic diversity and avoid perpetuating historical legal inequalities.

Building on Albania's alignment with EU data protection standards, the government should strengthen data protection and privacy safeguards for AI applications. This involves implementing privacy-by-design principles in all AI legal education platforms while minimizing data collection to essential functions only. Transparent consent mechanisms must clearly explain how personal data will be used, stored, and protected. User-friendly opt-out procedures should allow individuals to access legal information without surrendering personal data. The government should develop sector-specific Data Protection Impact Assessment templates for legal AI applications, as required under Articles 49 and 66 of Law No. 124/2024.

Albania should foster public-private partnerships while maintaining strong accountability mechanisms. Following the UK model, regulatory sandboxes should allow controlled testing of AI legal education tools under supervised conditions. Public procurement standards must require AI vendors to meet specific accuracy, transparency, and non-discrimination criteria. Mandatory explainability requirements should ensure AI systems can provide clear explanations of how legal information is generated and processed. Regular public reporting on AI system performance should include accuracy metrics, user satisfaction, and bias mitigation efforts.

Successful implementation requires building institutional capacity and inter-agency coordination. This includes developing comprehensive training programs for justice sector personnel on AI governance, digital rights, and technological oversight. Strong coordination mechanisms between the Ministry of Justice, the Commissioner for the Right to Information and Personal Data Protection, and other relevant regulatory bodies are essential. The government must allocate sufficient budget for ongoing AI monitoring, evaluation, and improvement activities. International cooperation with EU institutions and other countries should be prioritized to share best practices and align with emerging AI governance standards.

Finally, Albania must ensure alignment with international human rights standards throughout the AI integration process. This involves incorporating international AI ethics principles from the OECD, UNESCO, and Council of Europe into national legislation. Monitoring mechanisms should be established to ensure AI tools advance rather than obstruct SDG 16.3, which calls for equal access to justice. Appeal procedures must allow individuals to challenge AI-generated legal information that may affect their rights. Regular human rights impact assessments should evaluate whether AI tools are enhancing or hindering access to justice, ensuring that technological advancement serves the broader goal of strengthening democratic participation and the rule of law in Albania.

8. CONCLUSIONS

This study demonstrates that while AI presents significant opportunities to enhance public legal education in Albania, its integration must be approached with careful attention to legal, ethical, and human rights considerations. Albania's ongoing justice reforms and commitment to EU integration provide a favorable foundation for responsible AI deployment, particularly given the country's alignment with EU data protection standards through Law No. 124/2024. However, the absence of AI-specific governance frameworks creates regulatory gaps that must be addressed to prevent misinformation, algorithmic bias, and privacy violations that could undermine public trust in both AI tools and justice institutions.

The comparative analysis of Estonia, the United Kingdom, Canada, and Singapore reveals that successful AI integration in legal education requires technological capability and comprehensive regulatory oversight, human rights alignment, and sustained institutional commitment. Albania can learn from these experiences by adopting a rights-first approach that prioritizes accuracy, transparency, and inclusivity while fostering innovation through controlled experimentation and public-private partnerships. The policy recommendations outlined in this study provide a roadmap for Albania to harness AI's potential to improve legal literacy and democratic participation while safeguarding fundamental rights and strengthening public confidence in its evolving justice system. Ultimately, the responsible integration of AI into Albania's legal education framework represents not merely a technological upgrade, but an opportunity to advance the rule of law and create a more accessible, equitable justice system for all citizens.

9. REFERENCES

[1] D. McQuoid-Mason, **Using Technology to Enhance Access to Justice: The Role of Legal Aid Chatbots**, Potchefstroom Electron. Law J., 2020.

[2] e-Estonia, **New e-Estonia factsheet: National AI "Kratt" Strategy,** 26 Jun. 2020.

[3] Emerging Europe, **Meet Suve: Estonia's state-approved chatbot offering Covid-19 advice**, 2020.

[4] European Commission, **Digital public services based on open source: case study on Bürokratt**, Débora Lopes Gonçalves, 8 Jun. 2022.

[5] European Commission, **Albania 2023 Report,** 2023.

[6] E. Topol, **Deep Medicine: How Artificial Intelligence Can Make Healthcare Human Again**, Basic Books, 2019.

[7] H. Surden, **Artificial Intelligence and Law: An Overview,** Ga. St. Univ. Law Rev., vol. 35, no. 4, pp. 1305–1337, 2019.

[8] ICCPR, **Art. 19**, OHCHR Treaty Text.

[9] K. Crawford, **Atlas of AI: Power, Politics, and the Planetary Costs of Artificial Intelligence**, Yale Univ. Press, 2021.

[10] K. D. Ashley, **Artificial Intelligence and Legal Analytics: New Tools for Law Practice in the Digital Age**, Cambridge Univ. Press, 2017.

[11] KOMISIONI I POSAÇËM PARLAMENTAR PËR REFORMËN NË SISTEMIN E DREJTËSISË, **Analizë e Sistemit të Drejtësisë në Shqipëri, dokument i përgatitur nga Grupi i Ekspertëve të Nivelit të Lartë**, Tiranë, Qershor 2015.

[12] L. Webley and J. Flood, **Lawyers and Legal Services in the Digital Age**, Legal Ethics, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 3–22, 2021.

[13] Ministry of Economic Affairs and Communications, **Estonia's National Artificial Intelligence Strategy (Kratt Strategy) for 2022–2023**, February 2021.

[14] OECD and Open Society Foundations**, Access to Justice and the SDGs**, 2019.

[15] P. Leach, **Taking a Case to the European Court of Human Rights**, Oxford Univ. Press, 2020**.**

[16] P. Pleasence, N. J. Balmer, and A. Buck, **Causes of Action: Civil Law and Social Justice,** Legal Services Research Centre, 2006.

[17] P. van Dijk, et al., **Theory and Practice of the European Convention on Human Rights**, 5th ed., Intersentia, 2018.

[18] Riigikantselei (Government Office of Estonia), **Estonia will have an artificial intelligence strategy,** 27 Mar. 2018.

[19] R. L. Sandefur, **Access to Civil Justice and Race, Class, and Gender Inequality**, Annu. Rev. Sociol., vol. 34, pp. 339–358, 2008.

[20] R. Susskind, **Online Courts and the Future of Justice**, Oxford Univ. Press, 2019.

[21] S. Barocas, M. Hardt, and A. Narayanan, **Fairness and Machine Learning**, fairmlbook.org, 2019.

[22] S. Zuboff, **The Age of Surveillance Capitalism**, PublicAffairs, 2019.

[23] Top Channel, **Rama prezanton risitë e e-Albania! Njihuni me Diellën, ndihmësen virtuale zadrimore**, 19 Jan. 2025

[24] T. Wischmeyer, **Artificial Intelligence and Transparency: A Blueprint for Improving the Regulation of AI**, Ger. Law J., vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 94–103, 2020.

[25] UN Human Rights Committee, **General Comment No. 34**, CCPR/C/GC/34.

[26] UN Secretary-General, **Roadmap for Digital Cooperation**, 2020.

[27] UNDP, **Guidance Note on Legal Empowerment and Access to Justice**, 2019.

[28] UNDP, **Study on Access to Justice in Albania**, published Apr. 1, 2025.

[29] United Nations, Sustainable Development Goal 16, sdgs.un.org/goals/goal16.

[30] UNESCO, **Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence**, 2021.

[31] United Nations OHCHR, **The Right to Privacy in the Digital Age: Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights,** 2021.

[32] W. Holmes, et al., **Artificial intelligence in education: Promises and implications for teaching and learning**, Center for Curriculum Redesign, 2019.

[33] Wired, **Can AI Be a Fair Judge in Court? Estonia Thinks So**, 25 Mar. 2019.

[34] Wired, **How Estonia used its digital state to beat back coronavirus**, 19 Jun. 2020.

[35] Y. Bengio, et al., **Machine learning for finance: Challenges and opportunities**, J. Financ. Data Sci., 2021.

[36] Z. Obermeyer, et al., **Dissecting racial bias in an algorithm used to manage the health of populations**, Science, vol. 366, no. 6464, pp. 447–453, 2019.