



SUMMARY

CANDIDATE TEAM / TEAM REPRESENTATIVE	
NAME	Jon KOLA
ADDRESS	Bulevardi Zogu i Parë 10, Tirana, Albania
PHONE NUMBER	+355 69 964 8754
E-MAIL	jon.kola2002@gmail.com
REPRESENTING THE FACULTY OF	
NAME	Faculty of Law, University of Tirana
FUNCTION	Oriona Muçollari (Head of the Department of Public Law)
PHONE NUMBER	+355 68 205 0363
E-MAIL	oriona.mucollari@fdut.edu.al
ASSIGNED AWARDED PROJECT OF THE CRYSTAL SCALE	
TITLE	Hyper-automation of Order for Payment Procedures in Justice

(Please note that this summary should not exceed 2 pages)

PROJECT ANALYSIS:

This study provides a comprehensive legal analysis of the application of hyper-automation in order for payment procedures, using the Spanish model as a leading example of advanced digitalisation in judicial administration. It examines the integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Robotic Process Automation (RPA) into procedural workflows, particularly in relation to document classification, automated data extraction and the digital management and allocation of cases through interconnected platforms. In addition, the legal nature of the order for payment procedure is analysed as a highly standardised, high-volume and low-complexity mechanism, whose structural characteristics make it particularly suitable for technological optimisation.

Building upon this framework, the study advances a critical evaluation of the compatibility of hyper-automation with fundamental procedural guarantees and core principles of justice. The analysis is conducted within a multi-layered European legal context, addressing key issues such as the right to a fair trial, due process, transparency, accountability and data protection. The findings suggest that hyper-automation is, in principle, compatible with these standards, provided that it remains limited to auxiliary and administrative functions and does not interfere with judicial discretion. However, this compatibility is conditional, as risks such as algorithmic bias, limited transparency and the potential over-reliance on automated systems highlight the need for robust legal safeguards and continuous human oversight.

POTENTIAL IMPLEMENTATION IN OTHER EUROPEAN COUNTRIES:

The analysis explores whether the Spanish hyper-automation model for order-for-payment procedures can be implemented in other European judicial contexts in the near future and under what conditions. The model is treated

not simply as an AI tool, but as a structured form of procedural organisation combining electronic filing, standardised forms, automated extraction and classification of data, workflow automation through RPA and human supervision over legally sensitive acts. The core conditions for transferability are identified as the existence of a procedurally suitable and high-volume debt-recovery mechanism, reliable electronic filing, interoperability with case-management systems, sufficient digital and organisational readiness, and a clear legal boundary between administrative automation and judicial decision-making. The central conclusion is that the model is transferable only in a modular and conditional way, with the most exportable elements being structured filing, standardised data capture and rule-based clerical workflow.

These conditions are then tested in two contrasting contexts. Germany emerges as a favourable EU example because it already combines a highly standardised payment-order procedure with significant digital filing capacity, making modular implementation realistic so long as automation remains limited to intake and clerical processing. Albania, by contrast, illustrates a judicial system where the need for efficiency is acute, particularly in light of the large civil backlog before the General Court of Appeal, but where digital justice reform is still at a preparatory stage. The Spanish model could therefore not be transplanted there immediately, but it could serve as a sequenced reform model: first through digital infrastructure and standardised filing, then through low-risk workflow automation and only later through more advanced tools such as AI-assisted extraction. The broader lesson is that successful transfer depends less on technological ambition than on procedural suitability, legal safeguards, institutional readiness and the preservation of human responsibility wherever parties' rights may be affected.

METHODOLOGY USED:

The analysis is based on a doctrinal, analytical and critically evaluative methodology. It begins with a systematic deconstruction of the hyper-automation model into its principal technological and procedural components, enabling a detailed understanding of its functional architecture. These components are subsequently assessed against a multi-layered legal framework, encompassing national legislation, European human rights standards and regulatory instruments on data protection and artificial intelligence. This methodological approach allows for a progression from descriptive analysis to normative evaluation, facilitating a rigorous assessment of the legal permissibility, scope and limitations of hyper-automation within contemporary judicial processes.

For the research and implementation part, the team adopted a comparative, implementation-oriented method. It began by breaking the Spanish hyper-automation model down into its main transferable components, structured electronic filing, standardised procedural forms, automated extraction and classification of information, workflow automation through RPA, and human supervision over legally sensitive acts and then identified the conditions necessary for those components to function in another jurisdiction. These conditions included the existence of a suitable high-volume debt-recovery procedure, a reliable electronic filing system, interoperability with case-management software, sufficient organisational and digital readiness and a clear legal boundary between administrative automation and judicial decision-making. On that basis, the team selected two contrasting contexts for comparison: Germany, as a more procedurally and digitally mature EU system, and Albania, as a non-EU system still undergoing judicial digital transformation. Each was then assessed against the same transferability criteria in order to determine what could be implemented immediately, what would require prior reform and what should remain excluded from automation. This step-by-step method allowed the team to move from description to practical evaluation and to conclude that the model is transferable only in a modular and phased way, depending on the legal and institutional maturity of the receiving system.

APPENDIXES:

N/A