SEMINAR ORGANISED BY THE ITALIAN COUNCIL OF STATE IN COLLABORATION WITH THE HELLENIC COUNCIL OF STATE AND ACA-EUROPE
Turin, 23-24 November 2026

Technological challenges, with particular attention being paid to the introduction of digital technology and artificial intelligence into the organisation of the administration and administrative justice
QUESTIONNAIRE

Responses from SUPREME COURT OF ALBANIA

This questionnaire has been prepared in anticipation of the seminar to be held in Turin on 23 and 24 November 2026. In accordance with point 2 of the guiding principles adopted by the Hellenic Presidency of ACA-Europe, it aims to explore the current challenges facing administrative judges, particularly those related to technology, and more specifically the introduction of digitalisation and artificial intelligence into the organisation and functioning of the administration and administrative justice.
In order to gain an in-depth understanding of the various dimensions of these technological challenges, the survey is split into three parts:
Part A - The digitalisation of administrative proceedings, with a focus on the experience of various supreme administrative jurisdictions and the impact of this transformation on the organisation and conduct of judicial activity.
Part B - Automated administrative decision-making and judicial review by administrative courts, particularly issues of technical discretion, automation and the delimitation of judicial powers.
Part C - The role of the administrative judge and the use of artificial intelligence in the performance of judicial functions and in the decision-making process, particularly in light of Regulation (EU) 2024/1689, known as the 'AI Act', as well as other European Union standards and regulations, such as Regulation (EU) 2016/679, known as the 'GDPR', Regulation (EU) 2022/2065, known as the 'DSA', and Regulation (EU) 2022/1925, known as the 'DMA'.

Part A
The digitalisation of administrative proceedings and the use of artificial intelligence tools by the administrative justice system

A.I – Infrastructure and technological organisation
A.I.1 – Digital equipment and resources

Co-funded by the European Union

1. What is the level of digital equipment available to judges and administrative staff?

☐ Non-existent
☐ Limited
☐ Intermediate
X High
☐ Complete
Please explain if necessary:

Judges and support staff have access to hardware and software that allows them to connect securely and continuously from the office. This equipment includes:
– a desktop computer with a domestic connection;
– a printer;
– an institutional email account;
– OneDrive;
– access to the Microsoft Office 365 suite.
Also, a remote digital signature is available for the chancellor of the court only.

2. Is the technological infrastructure (networks, servers, equipment, connectivity) suited to the day-to-day operational needs of the administrative jurisdictions?

☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Somewhat disagree
☐ Neither agree nor disagree
X Somewhat agree
☐ Strongly agree

Please explain if necessary:

The technological infrastructure, offers a good framework that can ensure day to day operational needs, however this infrastructure remains rather outdated considering major technological developments we have today. Specifically, as our courts in Albania still lack an integrated case management system, which is currently under development and it's awaiting its first piloting only by the end of 2027, many functionalities remain manual and need immediate changes to ensure efficiency.

A.I.2 – Cloud solutions, remote access and interoperability
3. To what extent does your jurisdiction use cloud-based solutions for its information systems?

☐ Not at all
☐ To a limited extent
X Moderately
☐ Extensively

Co-funded by the European Union

☐ Completely

Please explain, where applicable, and, in the absence of cloud solutions, specify the alternative infrastructure solutions implemented:

The Albanian judiciary currently uses cloud-based solutions to a moderate extent. Most judicial IT infrastructure continues to rely primarily on centralised national servers hosted within government-controlled data centres, rather than full-scale public cloud services.

The case management systems used by the Supreme Court of Albania ICMIS (Integrated Case Management Information System) operates through centralized infrastructure managed by the judicial administration and national IT authorities.

Cloud solutions are mostly used to host the official website of the court and link with the publishing of judgments.

3a. Do the adopted technical solutions enable judges and staff to perform their duties remotely using the institutional equipment made available to them? If so, please specify any limitations.

As the judges and staff do not have any court granted devices where they can perform their remotely, remote solutions are usually carried in their own personal devices. However, working methods remain still quite traditional with judges and staff scanning and copying documents they need to study for cases from the case files.

3b. Are the applications being used interoperable with other national or cross-border judicial IT systems? If so, please specify the extent of this interoperability.

No. Each court management system works independently from other courts systems.

A.II – Digitalisation and dematerialisation of judicial administrative proceedings
A.II.1 – Dematerialised administrative proceedings
4. Is a dematerialised judicial administrative proceedings system in place within your jurisdiction?

X No
☐ Yes, at an initial stage
☐ Yes, at an intermediate stage
☐ Yes, at an advanced stage
☐ Yes, on a fully integrated basis
Please explain if necessary:

4a. When this system exists at least at an initial stage, do judges and staff process and sign documents exclusively in digital format in their everyday working practice?

Co-funded by the European Union

X Never (as mentioned earlier, digital signature is only available for the court chancellor, for signing public documents)
☐ Rarely
☐ Occasionally
☐ Frequently
☐ Always

Please explain if necessary:

4b. Percentage of paper files prior to the implementation of dematerialised administrative proceedings that have been digitised:
NA. We are still mostly paper based.

☐ 0–20%
☐ 20–40%
☐ 40–65%
☐ 60–80%
☐ 80–100%

A.II.2 – Digital services for members of the public, lawyers and public authorities
5. Are digital services available for filing documents, consulting files, notifications, payments or other related services? If so, please specify which ones.

No, none of these are available for the judiciary in a digitalized format. Citizens and legal representatives can file court documents or access them via the court public service offices. Notifications of judgments for the Supreme Court are also being carried via email when parties or legal representatives have given permission to be contacted via email.

6. Do these digital services guarantee an adequate level of accessibility for people with disabilities?
NA.

☐ 0–20%
☐ 20–40%
☐ 40–65%
☐ 60–80%
☐ 80 - 100%
7. Are lawyers involved in the design, development and implementation of digital platforms and tools intended for their use?
If so, please specify the terms of this involvement.
NA.

Co-funded by the European Union

8. Are there any support and training measures in place for users outside the court system (lawyers, members of the public, government agencies) regarding the use of the digital tools available to them?
X YES
□ NO

If so, please specify which ones
In order to enhance accessibility and user-friendliness, the Supreme Court of Albania has published on its official website a set of explanatory video tutorials aimed at guiding members of the public through the main functionalities of the platform. These videos explain how users can navigate the website, search for and access judicial decisions, and obtain information on the Court's activities and services. This initiative seeks to facilitate public access to judicial information and promote greater transparency in the functioning of the Court.

A.III – Security of information systems and data protection
A.III.1 – Compliance with the regulatory framework
9. Do your jurisdiction's information systems comply with European and national standards on security, data protection and digital preservation?

☐ Strongly disagree
X Agree only slightly
☐ Indifferent
☐ Somewhat agree
☐ Strongly agree

Please explain if necessary:

Yes. The information systems used by the Supreme Court of Albania operate in compliance with the national regulatory framework on information security, personal data protection and digital administration, while progressively aligning with European standards and best practices in judicial digitalisation and data governance.
With regard to personal data protection, its necessary to address that in the framework of transparency the Supreme Court of Albania publishes all of its judgments and so far there has been no need for anonymization as the legal framework did not provide for such an obligation. Following the adoption of the Act 124/2024 "On the protection of personal data" there is an obligation to anonymize courts judgments. In order to effectively carry anonymization, and also having regard to the large number of cases processed and judgments issued, the Supreme Court of Albania signed an agreement with the UNDP to build a digital tool that will anonymize decisions based on court guidelines with the help of AI.[1]

A.III.2 – Incident management and business continuity
10. Are IT security incidents dealt with promptly and effectively?
☐ Never

[1] See https://www.gjykataelarte.gov.al/sq/lajme/media/gjykata-e-larte-dhe-undp-nenshkruajne-memorandum-mirekuptimi

Co-funded by the European Union

☐ Rarely
☐ Occasionally
☐ Frequently
X Always

11. Are business continuity and disaster recovery plans regularly updated and tested?

☐ Never
☐ Rarely
X Occasionally
☐ Frequently
☐ Always

A.III.3 – Publicity and dissemination of court decisions
12. Are court decisions available online in their entirety?

☐ Never
☐ Rarely (only for the most significant decisions)
☐ Occasionally
☐ Frequently
X Always

Please add any additional information and explain if necessary:
The Supreme Court of Albania publishes all of its decision making in its public website which is accessible for all. Decisions on security measures in pre-trial detention are the only ones not publicly accessible as the measures addressed in adjudication are subject to redacted and sensitive investigative information.
13. Where a system for publishing decisions online is in place, is there an internal policy to ensure the protection of personal data and respect for the right to be forgotten?

☐ No
X No formalised policy; anonymisation is carried out by the registry services on a case-by-case basis
☐ No formalised policy; anonymisation is decided on a case-by-case basis on the instructions of judges
☐ Yes, personal data are systematically anonymised
☐ Yes, personal data are anonymised in accordance with an internal policy providing for targeted exceptions
☐ Other (please specify)

Co-funded by the European Union

As explained previously the Supreme Court of Albania, publishes all judgements and decisions in its website and the legal framework up until recently did not provide for an obligation to anonymize personal data. With the implementation of the system supported by the UNDP as per the memorandum signed the court will have an automated anonymization system.
However, anonymization of personal data is carried case by case, in cases of domestic violence, sexual abuse and where minors are involved.

A.IV – Training and digital skills

14. Does your jurisdiction offer structured and regularly updated digital technology training courses for judges and staff?
If so, please specify which ones.
No.

A.V – Involvement of judges in digital transformation

15. To what extent are judges involved in decision-making and design processes relating to technological innovation and digital transformation in the judiciary? If applicable, please provide details.
Major decision-making with regard digital transformation in the entire judiciary mostly rely with the High Council of the Judiciary which is mainly composed of judges and lay members. These digital changes are often carried in compliance with requirements for further EU integration benchmarks as well as previously reported needs from judges of all courts. For the anonymization project at Supreme Court, the working group that will provide the technical and legal guidelines is composed of judges and other administrative staff.

A.VI – Use of AI systems in administrative justice

A.VI.1 – Tools and level of deployment

16. Are artificial intelligence systems currently used to assist in judicial or administrative activities?
No.
16a. If so, which ones are used? (Please tick all that apply)
☐ Chatbots
☐ Semantic search tools
☐ Automated anonymisation of decisions
☐ Text analysis and assistance with legal research
☐ Tools to assist with organisation and court management
☐ Other (please specify)

Co-funded by the European Union

16b. Overall level of internal deployment of AI systems:
☐ Occasional or isolated use
☐ Trial phase
X Development phase (for anonymization)
☐ Widespread use
☐ Full integration

Please explain if necessary:
A.VII – Governance, regulation and ethical framework for AI
A.VII.1 – Internal guidelines and regulatory compliance
17. Has your jurisdiction adopted any internal guidelines, charters or policies governing the use of AI systems, in particular in application of Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 (the AI Act), the GDPR and other relevant European instruments?

□ YES
X NO
If so, please specify which ones.

18. Are AI systems subject to prior risk assessments?
□ YES
□ NO
If so, please specify the terms of these assessments
As there is no major ongoing judiciary AI system being modelled there is no general guidelines on risk assessment. For the Anonymization tool expecting to be developed for the Supreme Court the risk assessment strategy is part of the tasks that the working group of the court all together with the IT experts from the project will carry prior to the implementation.

19. Are there specific requirements in terms of transparency for the use of AI systems? If so, please provide details.
No.
20. Is the use of AI systems accompanied by human oversight mechanisms?
□ YES
□ NO
If so, please provide details
For the Supreme Courts anonymization tool, human oversight is still central to the architecture of the tool. The latter is supposed to be training according carefully crafted guidelines from the courts staff and IT experts, and it will in principle highlights all data that are supposed to be anonymized or pseudonymized, while as a last step the entire text will show changes in highlights and the legal assistant accepting it will have the functionalities to accept or reject changes, as well as add more.

21. Are specific methodologies implemented during the design, development and deployment of AI systems to ensure their traceability, reliability, integrity and accuracy? If so, please provide details.

Co-funded by the European Union

In the framework of the AI-assisted anonymization tool currently being developed for the publication of judicial decisions of the Supreme Court, specific methodological safeguards are integrated throughout the design, development and deployment phases to ensure traceability, reliability, integrity and accuracy.

The system is being developed on the basis of anonymization guidelines adopted by the Supreme Court, which define the categories of personal and sensitive data that must be redacted prior to the publication of court decisions. These rules constitute the normative reference for the functioning of the AI model and ensure compliance with the national legal framework on personal data protection, including Act No. 124/2024 "*On the Protection of Personal Data.*"

From a technical perspective, the development process includes the training and testing of the AI model on annotated datasets of judicial decisions, allowing the system to automatically detect and redact personal identifiers in accordance with the established anonymization rules.

The system also incorporates human oversight mechanisms, whereby the automated anonymization results can be reviewed and validated by authorized court staff before publication. This approach ensures that the system functions as a decision-support tool and not as an autonomous decision-making mechanism.

In addition, the system is designed to ensure traceability and auditability, as the anonymization operations performed by the tool are logged, enabling monitoring of the system's performance and facilitating quality control and corrective adjustments where necessary.

A.VIII – Innovation, prospects and future needs

A.VIII.1 – Current innovation projects

22. Are there any innovation projects currently under way in the following areas? (please tick all that apply)

☐ Process automation
☐ System interoperability
X Modernisation of existing systems
☐ Advanced digital services for external users
☐ AI systems
☐ Other (please specify)

A new integrated case management system is currently under development for all courts in Albania. It's expected to be piloted in late 2027.

A.VIII.2 – Barriers to digital transformation

Co-funded by the European Union

23 What do you consider to be the main barriers to the digital transformation of administrative justice? (please tick all that apply)

☐ Complexity of the regulatory framework
X Insufficient financial resources
X Lack of specialised human resources
☐ Organisational complexity
X Resistance to change and digital skills gap
X Cybersecurity risks and challenges
☐ Other (please specify)

A.VIII.3 – Investment priorities

24. What do you think should be the priority areas for investment over the next few years? (please tick all that apply)

X Modernisation of infrastructure
☐ Cybersecurity
X Training and skills development
X Deployment of AI systems
☐ Interoperability at European level
X Complete digitalisation of administrative procedures
☐ Other (please specify)

25. Please describe one or more good practices in digitalisation that have been implemented or are planned within your jurisdiction.

Although the development of AI-assisted anonymization tools is currently in an early phase of its conception, we believe that in principle is a good practice**.** Following the adoption of Law No. 124/2024 "On the Protection of Personal Data", courts among other public institutions are required to anonymize judicial decisions before publication. In order to manage the large number of decisions processed and published by the courts, the Supreme Court of Albania has initiated the development of a digital tool based on artificial intelligence for the anonymization of judicial decisions, in cooperation with UNDP. The system is designed to automatically identify and redact personal data contained in judicial decisions prior to publication. Importantly, this tool functions only as a support mechanism, and the anonymization results remain subject to human verification by authorized court staff before publication.

Part B
Automated administrative decisions and judicial review

B.I – Automated administrative decisions: substantive legality and procedure

1. Are there provisions in your legal system that authorise public administrations to use digital or algorithmic technologies in the exercise of their powers?

Co-funded by the European Union

□ YES
X NO

Yes. The Albanian legal framework allows public administrations to use digital and information technologies in the exercise of their functions, particularly in the context of the broader digitalization of public services and administrative procedures. This has mainly been carried via the ***e-albania*** platform, which is a Government Interaction Platform for the provision of electronic services administered and developed by the National Agency for Information Society (NAIS). It serves as a gateway through which any interested person (citizen or public servant with additional access) may obtain, via the internet, electronic services provided by public institutions in the Republic of Albania.

Through this platform, administrative procedures have been significantly simplified, and actions carried out online through a computer, tablet, or smartphone by using the e-Albania platform enable users to download in real time documents with legal validity.

The use of digital tools by public authorities is primarily governed by the Albania's Digital Agenda Strategy 2022-2026 and Action Plan. These, frameworks support the use of technological solutions for data processing and administrative efficiency via digitalization.

At the same time, the exercise of public powers and the adoption of administrative acts remain subject to the principles of legality, transparency, accountability and due process, as established in the Code of Administrative Procedures of the Republic of Albania and other relevant legislation. Consequently, even where digital or algorithmic technologies are used to support administrative processes, responsibility for the final decision remains with the competent public authority.

If so:
1.a. According to these provisions, what are the authorised tools and the objectives pursued by their use?

According to Decision No. 370/2022, the digital transformation of public administration is implemented through a set of digital infrastructures, platforms and technological systems designed to enable electronic public services and the automated processing of administrative procedures. The main tools authorized and promoted include:

Government Interoperability Platform) enabling data exchange between public institutions. The unique government portal e-Albania, which serves as the central gateway for accessing electronic public services. Electronic identification, electronic signatures and electronic seals for public administration to issue official documents with full legal value in digital format. Government data infrastructure comprising Government Data Centres and GovNet government network, as well as emerging technologies, foreseeing the gradual integration of advanced technologies such as artificial intelligence and blockchain in order to improve service delivery and enhance the automation and interoperability of administrative systems.

Co-funded by the European Union

With regard to the objectives pursued, the use of these technologies aims to simplify administrative procedures, increase efficiency and transparency of public administration, reduce bureaucratic burden and processing time for citizens and businesses, enable electronic communication and data exchange between public institutions, expand access to public services through digital platforms.

1.b. What types of acts can be adopted using these technologies?
In particular, is the use of algorithms permitted for the adoption of administrative decisions involving discretionary powers?

The strategy provides that digital platforms allow the issuance of administrative documents with legal value in electronic form, including certificates, authorizations and other administrative documents that can be downloaded online with electronic seal or signature. Examples mentioned include:

- civil status certificates,
- educational certificates and documents,
- business registration documents,
- licenses and administrative permits,
- tax-related documents and fiscal certificates,
- cadastral documents,
- consular documents and visas,
- administrative attestations and other official records.

While the range of services you can receive from the platform keeps increasing day to day, it must be reiterated that algorithms do not adopt decisions *per se,* but rather extract information from public registers and issue them into the attestation form which before would need to be issued manually by the institution.

2. Are there provisions in your legal system governing the design, deployment and use of artificial intelligence systems employed by public administrations?

X YES
□ NO
If so,
2.a. what type of implementation measures are these? (for example, legislative or soft law):

As mentioned previously these frameworks are governed by the Albania's Digital Agenda Strategy 2022-2026 and Action Plan.

2.b. Is there an obligation for public administrations to inform the public or individuals about the use of AI systems?

At the moment there is no such provision in the governing framework mentioned earlier.
2.c. Are any authorities or bodies responsible for developing general rules or standards for the use of artificial intelligence within public administrations?

Co-funded by the European Union

In Albania, the development of general policies, frameworks and technical standards for the use of digital technologies within public administration falls primarily within the competence of the National Agency for Information Society (AKSHI), which operates under the authority of the Council of Ministers.

AKSHI is responsible for the development, administration and standardization of government digital infrastructure and platforms, including the ***e-Albania portal***, the government interoperability platform, and other information systems used by public institutions. In this capacity, the agency also contributes to the establishment of technical standards, interoperability frameworks and digital governance rules applicable to public administrations.

The strategic framework for the development and use of advanced digital technologies, including artificial intelligence, is outlined in the Digital Agenda of Albania 2022–2026, adopted by Decision of the Council of Ministers No. 370, dated 1 June 2022. This strategy promotes the exploration and gradual integration of emerging technologies, including AI, in the delivery of public services.

However, at present specific binding rules or comprehensive regulatory standards governing the use of artificial intelligence in public administration are still under development, and the existing framework primarily addresses broader aspects of digital governance, data management and public service digitalization.

3. What conditions must be met to ensure the legality of administrative procedures involving the use of artificial intelligence systems?

At present, the Albanian legal framework does not contain specific procedural provisions regulating the use of artificial intelligence systems in administrative decision-making. Consequently, the legality of administrative procedures involving digital or automated technologies must be ensured through the general principles and guarantees established in the Code of Administrative Procedures of the Republic of Albania, including the principles of legality, transparency, proportionality, due process, and the right to be heard.

Administrative acts must be reasoned and attributable to the competent public authority, and responsibility for the decision remains with the administrative body or official exercising the relevant public powers. Digital or automated systems may therefore be used only as support tools in administrative procedures, without replacing the responsibility of the administration for the final decision.

In particular:
3.a. Is the decision-making administration required to indicate the type of algorithmic system used and its principal characteristics?

There is currently no explicit legal requirement obliging public administrations to indicate the specific type of algorithmic system used or to describe its technical characteristics when adopting an administrative decision. However, administrative acts must comply with the general duty to provide reasons, meaning that the authority must explain the legal and factual

Co-funded by the European Union

basis of its decision. Where digital tools are used in the preparation of an administrative act, the administration remains responsible for the reasoning and legality of the final decision.

3.b. At what stage of the procedure must the administration provide information about the use of an algorithmic system and its characteristics?
Since the legal framework does not specifically regulate the use of AI systems in administrative procedures, no specific stage of the procedure is defined for providing information about the use of algorithmic systems.

3.c. Does the interested party have the opportunity to comment on or challenge the use or operation of the AI system before the final decision is made?

The Albanian legal framework does not currently provide specific procedural rights to challenge the use or functioning of an AI system during an administrative procedure. However, interested parties benefit from the general procedural guarantees provided by the Code of Administrative Procedures, including: principles of legality, transparency, information, participation, reason-giving, lawful exercise of discretion, and review[2].

Therefore, while there is no AI-specific challenge mechanism, individuals may contest the legality, reasoning or factual basis of an administrative decision through the ordinary administrative and judicial remedies provided by law.

4. Are specific areas of administrative law in your country subject to express authorisation for the use of administrative decisions based on artificial intelligence systems?

No. The Albanian legal framework does not currently provide specific statutory provisions expressly authorizing the adoption of administrative decisions based on artificial intelligence systems in any particular area of administrative law. While public administration has increasingly adopted digital technologies and electronic systems for the delivery of public

[2] **Article 4 (Principle of legality):** public bodies must act in accordance with the Constitution, ratified international agreements, and applicable legislation, within the limits of their competence and for the purpose for which that competence was granted. Rights or lawful interests may not be impaired except as provided by law and with due process.
Article 5 (Principle of transparency): public bodies must carry out administrative activity transparently and in close cooperation with the persons involved.
Article 6 (Principle of information): every person may request public information concerning the activity of the public body.
Article 10 (Principle of active assistance): the authority must inform parties of their rights and obligations, including all information related to the procedure, and warn them of the legal consequences of their acts or omissions.
Article 11 (Lawful exercise of discretion): where discretion exists, it must be expressly provided by law, remain within legal limits, pursue only the lawful objective for which it was allowed, comply with the general principles of the Code, and not unjustifiably depart from prior practice in similar cases.
Article 14 (Principle of objectivity): authorities must take into account all conditions, data and evidence related to the administrative procedure.
Article 21 (Principle of control): administrative activity is subject to administrative review, judicial review, and any other control provided by law.

Co-funded by the European Union

services (as mentioned via the e-Albania governmental platform and other digital infrastructures managed by the National Agency for Information Society (AKSHI)) these technologies are primarily used to facilitate administrative procedures, process applications, and generate administrative documents in electronic form.

5. Are there specific areas of administrative law in which the use of artificial intelligence systems for issuing administrative decisions is expressly prohibited?

No. At present, the Albanian legal system does not contain explicit provisions prohibiting the use of artificial intelligence systems for issuing administrative decisions in specific areas of administrative law. However, it should be noted that the current regulatory framework does not yet establish a specific legal regime governing the use of AI in administrative decision-making. In practice, digital technologies are used primarily to support administrative processes and service delivery and not to replace human decision-making.

B.II – Judicial review of automated administrative decisions

6. Does national case-law recognise the legality of automated administrative decisions?

□ YES
□ NO

Please explain if necessary:

At present, Albanian national case-law does not specifically address or recognize the legality of automated administrative decisions based on artificial intelligence or algorithmic systems.

If so:

6.a. What principles and conditions have been identified by national case-law as necessary for these decisions to be legally valid?

NA.

6.b. Have any limitations been identified with regard to the possibility of delegating the administration's decision-making power to algorithmic systems?

Not applicable. Albanian courts have not yet addressed this issue in their case-law.

6.c. In particular, which of the following principles must be respected, according to national case-law, when adopting an automated administrative decision? (Please tick all that apply)

□ Principle of transparency
□ Principle of non-exclusivity of human intervention ('human in the loop')
□ Principle of non-discrimination
□ Principle of knowledge and comprehensibility of algorithmic functioning
□ Principle of attributing the decision to an authority vested with power

Co-funded by the European Union

□ Other (please specify)

Although these principles have not yet been developed in Albanian case-law concerning AI, several of them correspond to general principles of administrative law already recognized in the Code of Administrative Procedures, such as legality, transparency, objectivity, reason-giving, and accountability of the competent authority.

7. Has national case-law ruled on the nature and legal classification of the algorithm or AI system used for administrative decision-making?

No.

8. What are the limits of the judicial review that administrative judges can exercise over automated administrative decisions?

Since automated administrative decisions based on AI systems have not yet been examined in Albanian case-law, no specific limits of judicial review have been established by the courts in this context. However, in general terms, administrative courts exercise full judicial review over administrative acts, including review of:

- the competence of the authority issuing the act,
- the correct application of the law,
- the factual basis and evidence relied upon,
- the reasoning of the administrative decision, and
- the lawful exercise of administrative discretion.

These review powers derive from the general framework governing administrative procedures and judicial review of administrative acts, particularly the Code of Administrative Procedures (Act No. 44/2015) and the Act No. 49/2012 "On Administrative Courts and the Adjudication of Administrative Disputes". Consequently, even where digital or automated systems may assist administrative authorities, the final administrative act remains subject to judicial scrutiny as an act attributable to the competent public authority.

9. According to national case-law, is the right of access to the algorithmic process that led to the automated administrative decision recognised?

□ YES
X NO

At present, Albanian national case-law has not recognized a specific right of access to the algorithmic process underlying automated administrative decisions. This is largely because AI-based decision-making has not yet been addressed by administrative courts, and automated systems are not currently used to independently adopt administrative acts.

If so:

Co-funded by the European Union

9.a. What information relating to the AI system (data, logic, key parameters) must be made available to the party concerned?
NA.

Part C
Administrative judges and the use of artificial intelligence in the performance of judicial functions and in the decision-making process, in light of Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 (the 'AI Act') and other European Union standards and regulations, such as the GDPR, the DSA, the DMA, etc.

1. Does your country recognise, at constitutional level, principles that expressly refer to the use of artificial intelligence in the performance of judicial functions?

□ YES
X NO
If so, please specify which ones

The Albanian Constitution regulates the functioning of the judiciary and the guarantees of judicial activity through general constitutional principles, such as the rule of law, due process, protection of fundamental rights and the independence of courts. These provisions apply to the administration of justice regardless of the technological tools used, but they do not explicitly regulate or authorize the use of AI systems in judicial decision-making.

2. Has your country adopted or is it in the process of adopting national measures to implement Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 (the AI Act) concerning the use of artificial intelligence to support judicial decision-making, which is classified as a 'high-risk' activity (Annex III, point 8(a))?

□ YES
X NO

No specific national measures have yet been adopted in Albania to implement Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 (the Artificial Intelligence Act). Albania is not a Member State of the European Union, and therefore Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 does not apply directly within the Albanian legal order. However, as an EU candidate country, Albania is progressively aligning its legislation and public policies with the EU acquis, including in the areas of digital governance, data protection and emerging technologies.

At present, there are no specific legislative or regulatory instruments adopted at national level that implement the AI Act with regard to the use of artificial intelligence in judicial decision-making, nor are there provisions specifically regulating AI systems used to support judicial adjudication.

If so:

Co-funded by the European Union

2.a. What is the nature of these measures (legislative, regulatory, guidelines, soft-law instruments)?
NA.

2.b. For what purposes is the use of AI permitted? (Please tick all that apply)

□ Research and interpretation of the law
□ Research and assessment of the facts
□ Application of the law to a specific factual situation
X Administrative activities that are purely ancillary (recital 61 of Regulation (EU) 2024/1689)
Please explain if necessary:

At the moment, Albania does not have a specific legal framework regulating the use of artificial intelligence systems in judicial decision-making. Consequently, AI is not authorized to perform adjudicative functions, such as assessing evidence or applying the law to a specific factual situation in order to produce judicial decisions. However, administrative and technical functions, such as the development of digital tools for the anonymization of judicial decisions prior to publication are categorized under the administrative activities that are purely ancillary.

2.c. What measures are taken to ensure human oversight (Article 14 of Regulation (EU) 2024/1689)? In particular, under what conditions is the user able to ignore, cancel or override the result produced by the artificial intelligence system (Article 14(4)(d) of the AI Act), or to suspend or interrupt its use (Article 14(4)(d) of the AI Act)?
NA.

2.d. What regulatory measures have been adopted to ensure the transparency, accuracy and robustness of the artificial intelligence system used (Articles 13 and 15 of Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 – the AI Act)?
NA.

3. Are there any official forms of testing or use of artificial intelligence systems for decision-making or generating judicial decisions currently in place in your country?

□ YES
X NO
Please explain if necessary:

If so:

Co-funded by the European Union

3.a What do they consist of?

The only initiatives involving AI within the judicial sector concern supportive technological tools currently under development, for example systems designed to automatically anonymize judicial decisions before their publication on court websites. These tools aim to assist courts in complying with the legal obligations on personal data protection and transparency of judicial activity, by identifying and redacting personal data contained in court decisions prior to publication. The system operates as a technical support tool and does not intervene in the adjudication process or influence judicial reasoning.

3.b. What data sets are used?

The anonymization tool is being developed using datasets consisting of judicial decisions issued by the courts (already published in the website without anonymization), which are used for the purpose of identifying categories of personal data that must be redacted before publication. These datasets include judgments and decisions of the courts, which are processed in accordance with the applicable legal framework on personal data protection.

3.c. Is the software used publicly owned or provided by private operators?

The development of the anonymization tool is carried out within the framework of cooperation between the Supreme Court of Albania and **UNDP**, with the technical development of the software undertaken by specialized developers and IT staff of the court. The system is intended to be deployed and used within the judiciary under institutional control, and its operation remains subject to the supervision of the competent public authorities responsible for court administration.

3.d. Have any biases been identified in its operation? If so, what kind?

No biases have been formally identified at this stage. Because the system does not assess facts, interpret legal norms or generate judicial reasoning, the risk of substantive decision-making bias is currently limited. Also, the system remains subject to human supervision and validation in order to ensure the accuracy of anonymization and prevent potential errors.

4. Are measures planned in your country to ensure a sufficient level of artificial intelligence literacy specifically for judges (Article 4 of Regulation (EU) 2024/1689)?
X YES
□ NO
If so:
4.a. What do these measures consist of?

Co-funded by the European Union

Also, not in the context of for this regulation, judicial institutions are considering measures within the broader framework of judicial training and digital transformation to enhance judges' understanding of emerging technologies. For the Supreme Court Anonymization project testing and training will be carried for a year- long period in order to ensure proper work optimization and understanding of the court staff (judges included).

4.b. Is specific training planned to prevent or limit the phenomenon known as 'automation bias' (Article 14(4)(b) of the AI Act)?

□ YES
X NO
Please explain if necessary:

At present, no specific training programmes addressing "automation bias" in the sense defined in the AI Act have been formally introduced. However, general training initiatives on digital tools, legal reasoning and judicial independence contribute indirectly to ensuring that judges maintain full control over the decision-making process and critically assess technological outputs.

5. Is the use of generative or agentic artificial intelligence systems permitted in your country to assist in the drafting of procedural documents or court decisions?

To help you understand the question better: **generative artificial intelligence (AI)** is a category of AI models which, thanks to machine learning and training on vast amounts of data, are capable of creating original content (text, images, videos, music, etc.). **Agentic AI** is described as a system capable of autonomously planning, making decisions and executing complex tasks with minimal human intervention to achieve a defined objective [source: OECD].

NA.

6. Has the national case law of your country addressed issues concerning the interpretation and application of EU Regulation 2024/1689?

□ YES
X NO
Please explain if necessary:

6.a. If yes, which principles have been established?

7. Have national courts of your country submitted preliminary rulings to the Court of Justice of the European Union regarding EU Regulation 2024/1689?

□ YES
X NO
Please explain if necessary:

Co-funded by the European Union

7.a. If yes, which questions were referred? What answers has the Court of Justice of the European Union provided?
NA.

Co-funded by the European Union