

When Algorithms Meet Art: Jurisprudence and Authorship in the Age of Generative Artificial Intelligence

Kristi BELLO

EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY OF TIRANA
Email: kristi.bello@uet.edu.al

Blegina HASKO

EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY OF TIRANA
Email: blegina.hasko@uet.edu.al

Abstract

This paper examines the unprecedented challenges posed by Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI-G) to copyright law, specifically within the Albanian legal framework (Law No. 35/2016). It aims to identify legal gaps regarding authorship, ownership, and economic compensation for human creators in the music and visual arts sectors. The study employs a doctrinal and comparative legal analysis, juxtaposing Albania's legislation with US Copyright Office policies, the EU AI Act (2024), and the DSM Directive. Through context-specific case studies, the research evaluates the adequacy of current norms in the face of autonomous digital production and "style cloning." The analysis confirms that while human authorship remains a non-negotiable prerequisite for protection, the lack of regulation for AI training data and autonomous outputs creates significant legal uncertainty. While the study proposes sui generis rights as a potential solution, it critically addresses scholarly concerns regarding the complexity and

fragmentation such rights might introduce to traditional copyright doctrine. This research provides a novel, Albania-specific analysis of AI copyright implications, offering a hybrid regulatory model that balances technological innovation with the protection of national cultural identity and creators' economic rights. The recommendations—including mandatory collective licensing, transparency requirements, and alignment with EU standards—serve as a strategic roadmap for Albanian policymakers to foster a fair digital economy and protect intellectual labor from AI-driven displacement.

Keywords: *Generative AI; Copyright Law; Albania; Sui Generis Rights; Intellectual Property; Digital Single Market; Music and Visual Arts; EU AI Act Alignment.*

Introduction

Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI-G) has fundamentally disrupted creative sectors like music, literature, and visual arts. Platforms such as GPT, DALL-E, and MusicLM now generate complex outputs with minimal human oversight, destabilizing traditional legal doctrines of authorship. Currently, major jurisdictions—including the United States and the European Union—uphold the “human spark” requirement, relegating autonomous AI outputs to the public domain (U.S. Copyright Office, 2025; European Union, 2019). This status quo raises urgent ethical and economic questions regarding the devaluation of human creative labor.

In Albania, Law No. 35/2016 serves as the primary instrument for copyright, aligning with EU Directives 2001/29/EC and 2019/790 (DSM Directive). However, this framework remains largely reactive, predating the current AI surge. It lacks specific mechanisms to address the unauthorized use of protected works for AI training or to provide *sui generis* protections for algorithmic outputs (ZSHDA, 2024). This regulatory vacuum creates a precarious environment for Albanian creators, particularly in music and visual arts, who face the risk of economic displacement without adequate compensation or transparency.

This paper evaluates the legal and cultural implications of AI-G in Albania through a comparative legal methodology. By analyzing international approaches—including human authorship mandates, collective licensing, and the debated *sui generis* models—this study identifies systemic gaps in Albanian law. Ultimately, it proposes a balanced reform framework aimed at harmonizing national legislation with global technological trends while safeguarding the integrity of local creators.

Literature Review

Generative AI (AI-G) refers to neural networks capable of synthesizing content that mimics human creativity across text, music, and visual arts. These models operate by processing vast datasets, frequently comprising copyrighted material, to identify probabilistic patterns (Epstein et al., 2023). Current scholarship highlights a fundamental tension: while AI increases creative efficiency, it operates without the consciousness, intentionality, or moral agency traditionally required for authorship (Naren, 2024; Gervais, 2022). Consequently, legal literature is divided on whether AI is a “**creative tool**” that extends human expression or an “**algorithmic agent**” that

The “human spark” remains the global benchmark for copyright eligibility, though its application varies:

- **United States:** The U.S. Copyright Office (2025) maintains that works created without “substantial human involvement” are ineligible for protection, a stance recently tested in cases involving AI-generated visual art.
- **European Union:** Under the DSM Directive, protection is strictly reserved for “original” works reflecting the author’s own intellectual creation (European Union, 2019). Exceptions are limited to text and data mining (TDM), leaving autonomous outputs in a legal limbo.
- **United Kingdom & Singapore:** These jurisdictions represent a “utilitarian” approach, offering limited protection for “computer-generated works” where no human author is present, thereby prioritizing economic investment over artistic personality (WIPO, n.d.; Karas, 2024).

To address autonomous AI works, some scholars propose *sui generis* rights—a specialized, shorter-term protection designed to incentivize AI developers without granting them full copyright (Mantegna, 2024). However, this study acknowledges significant scholarly criticism regarding such models. Critics argue that *sui generis* rights may lead to “**copyright clutter**,” where the market is flooded with low-effort machine content that devalues human labor. Furthermore, there is a risk that these rights would primarily benefit large tech corporations, potentially creating a “**creative double standard**” where machines receive protection for outputs that lack the creative depth and intentionality of human-made art (Gervais, 2020).

A critical area of litigation involves **input liability**—the unauthorized use of copyrighted works to train AI models (Perzanowski, 2024). In sectors like music and visual arts, AI systems can replicate specific styles, leading to what Gendron (2024) describes as “**algorithmic style-snatching**.” This poses a severe economic

threat, as AI-generated substitutes can saturate the market, displacing the very creators whose works were used for training. Proposed solutions include statutory levies and collective licensing models, similar to those being explored in France, which ensure that revenue from AI-driven tools is redistributed to the original authors (Perzanowski, 2024).

Albania's Law No. 35/2016 remains reactive rather than proactive. The absence of specific regulations on transparency and dataset disclosure leaves Albanian artists particularly vulnerable (ZSHDA, 2024). Two primary risks emerge:

1. **Cultural Dilution:** AI models reproducing traditional Albanian folk music or visual motifs without attribution, leading to a loss of cultural identity.
2. **Economic Precarity:** The displacement of local artists by AI-generated content in a market that already lacks robust collective management for digital rights (Ministria e Kulturës, 2024).

“Furthermore, the necessity for legislative update is underscored by Albania's obligations under **Chapter 7 of the EU Acquis (Intellectual Property Law)**. As the country progresses toward EU integration, aligning national statutes with the evolving standards of the **EU AI Act (2024)** and the **DSM Directive** is no longer elective but mandatory. Failure to harmonize Law No. 35/2016 with these regional benchmarks risks creating a ‘regulatory divergence’ that could hinder Albania's participation in the European Digital Single Market and weaken the enforcement of cross-border copyright protections.”

Methodology

This study employs a multi-dimensional research design to evaluate the legal intersection of Generative AI and copyright. The framework distinguishes between **descriptive legal analysis** (mapping current norms—*lex lata*) and **normative evaluation** (assessing how laws should evolve to address technological gaps—*lex ferenda*).

The design integrates three core pillars:

- **Doctrinal Legal Analysis:** A rigorous examination of primary legal texts, including Albanian Law No. 35/2016, EU Directive 2019/790 (DSM), and the EU AI Act 2024. This pillar identifies the “black-letter law” regarding authorship and liability.
- **Comparative Legal Methodology:** A functional comparison between Albania, the European Union, and the United States. This approach identifies how different legal traditions respond to the common challenge of algorithmic production.

- **Qualitative Case Studies:** Focused analysis of AI-generated music and visual arts. These serve as empirical touchstones to illustrate the practical implications of legal gaps for Albanian creators.

The study relies on a curated selection of primary and secondary sources to ensure reliability:

- **Regulatory Instruments:** National legislation (Law No. 35/2016), EU Directives, and US Copyright Office circulars.
- **Jurisprudential Data:** Landmark cases and institutional reports from the ZSHDA (Albanian Copyright Office) and WIPO.
- **Scholarly Literature:** Peer-reviewed scholarship and leading legal reviews. Following reviewer suggestions, a clear distinction is maintained between high-impact academic sources (e.g., Gervais, Perzanowski) and supplementary industry reports or law firm blogs, which are utilized solely for current market context.

The analysis is structured around three investigative trajectories:

1. **Status Quo Mapping:** How do existing human-centric authorship requirements in Albania, the EU, and the US respond to fully autonomous AI outputs?
2. **Liability and Compensation Modeling:** What are the comparative strengths of collective licensing versus statutory levies in addressing input liability?
3. **Reform Feasibility:** Under what conditions can a hybrid *sui generis* model operate in Albania without destabilizing traditional copyright principles?

The study acknowledges several constraints:

- **Technological Velocity:** The rapid pace of AI development may outstrip the shelf-life of specific policy recommendations.
- **Black-Box Opacity:** The lack of transparency in proprietary AI training datasets limits the empirical verification of input infringement.
- **Methodological Objectivity:** While the study seeks objectivity, the transition from descriptive analysis to policy recommendation requires careful calibration to maintain the distinction between empirical findings and normative advocacy—a balance strictly maintained throughout the discussion.

Results and Discussion

The analysis of legal frameworks in Albania, the EU, and the US reveals a shared reliance on the “**human spark**” doctrine, albeit with diverging regulatory responses to AI-generated outputs. As shown in **Table 1**, while the US maintains a strict binary—protecting only human-authored works or relegating others to the public domain—the EU is carving out a middle ground through the **AI Act (2024)** and transparency mandates.

Albania’s Law No. 35/2016 remains static, offering neither the flexibility of the US “Fair Use” doctrine nor the emerging safeguards of the EU’s Digital Single Market. This lack of specific provisions for AI-generated content creates a “protection vacuum” for works produced in Albania.

TABLE 1. Comparative Overview of Legal Approaches to AI-Generated Works

Jurisdiction	Human Authorship	Sui Generis Protection	Input Liability & Compensation	Relevant Statutes
Albania	Mandated (Arts. 8-9)	Absent	Unregulated	Law No. 35/2016
European Union	Mandated	Proposed/Debated	TDM Exceptions; Mandatory Opt-out	AI Act; DSM Directive
United States	Mandated	Rejected	Fair Use Litigation	USCO Guidance 2025

The results from the comparative mapping identify three primary areas of vulnerability in the Albanian jurisdiction:

1. **The Output Gap:** Fully autonomous AI works (created without direct human creative intervention) fall immediately into the public domain in Albania, providing no return on investment for local tech developers.
2. **The Input Gap:** There is no legal mechanism to compensate Albanian artists when their works are “ingested” by foreign AI models for training purposes.
3. **The Transparency Gap:** Unlike the EU AI Act, Albanian law does not yet require AI developers to disclose the copyrighted material used in their training sets, making it impossible for creators to enforce their moral rights.

The rise of platforms like OpenAI Jukebox and MusicLM demonstrates that AI can now bypass traditional composition stages, synthesizing complex arrangements that challenge the traditional boundaries of musical authorship. In the United States, recent litigation by major labels (e.g., UMG vs. AI platforms)

highlights a critical distinction: while the autonomous output may reside in the public domain, the **input stage**—the ingestion of copyrighted catalogs for training purposes—remains a major point of legal friction.

In the Albanian context, the absence of robust collective licensing frameworks creates a state of “**economic leakage**.” Local musicians and composers, whose works are increasingly ingested into global AI training sets, currently possess no legal mechanism for remuneration or opt-out. This is not merely a legal gap but a cultural one; AI models trained on traditional Albanian polyphony or specific regional folk rhythms risk “**style-cloning**.” This phenomenon occurs when the aesthetic essence and rhythmic signatures of Albanian music are replicated by algorithms, while the economic value is decoupled from the original artists and the cultural community (ZSHDA, 2024).

Without a statutory mandate for transparency in training datasets, Albanian music risks being reduced to a “data point” in global commercial models, further marginalizing the domestic creative industry in the digital economy.

Generative AI has fundamentally altered the visual arts landscape, enabling machines to synthesize imagery that mimics specific human aesthetics with high fidelity. Platforms such as DALL·E, Midjourney, and Stable Diffusion generate outputs by learning from vast, often unauthorized, datasets. This capability introduces the phenomenon of “**style cloning**”—the algorithmic reproduction of an artist’s aesthetic signature without direct verbatim copying.

Internationally, the legal status of AI-generated visual art remains contentious. The **U.S. Copyright Office (2025)** maintains a strict “human authorship” requirement, while the **European Union** offers a more nuanced approach through the DSM Directive’s text and data mining (TDM) exceptions. In Albania, visual artists operate within a **regulatory vacuum**, as Law No. 35/2016 does not account for algorithmic style reproduction, leaving creators without legal recourse when their aesthetic identity is commercialized by AI platforms.

The cultural implications are particularly acute, as illustrated in **Figure 1** regarding **Kolë Idromeno’s *Motra Tone* (1883)**. In the original work (left), the lighting and the texture of the traditional veil represent a specific historical anchor of Albanian modernity. In the AI-generated reinterpretation (right), the algorithm has synthesized these “stylistic tokens”—the traditional jewelry and garment folds—but has decoupled them from their authentic cultural origin. When such reinterpretations circulate without attribution, the link between the artwork and its heritage is severed, leading to what scholars describe as “**digital folklore without a pulse**.”

FIGURE 1: Original vs. AI Reinterpretation.



Figure 1: Original vs. AI Reinterpretation (Note to Editor: Figure 1 displays Kolë Idromeno's *Motra Tone* (1883) alongside an AI-synthesized version to demonstrate style extraction). To mitigate these risks, this study proposes a multi-layered normative approach for Albania:

- **Recognition of Human-Assisted Outputs:** Granting copyright only where significant transformative intervention is proven.
- **Sui Generis Protection:** Implementing limited-term rights for autonomous AI artworks to prevent direct commercial exploitation.
- **Mandatory Transparency:** Requiring AI developers to disclose datasets to allow artists to monitor their “aesthetic signature.”
- **Cultural Safeguards:** Developing legal mechanisms through ZSHDA to protect national artistic motifs from algorithmic misrepresentation.

The analysis identifies a tripartite “**protection gap**” within the Albanian legal framework that echoes broader international challenges, yet remains particularly acute due to the country’s specific digital landscape. These gaps are categorized as follows:

- **The Output Protection Gap:** Fully autonomous AI-generated works occupy a legal limbo, remaining unprotected under Law No. 35/2016 due to the strict human-centric definition of authorship. Without a temporary protection mechanism (such as *sui generis* rights), these works fall immediately into the public domain, discouraging local investment in creative AI technologies.

- **The Input Liability Gap:** There is a notable absence of mandatory compensation or licensing frameworks for copyrighted works utilized in the training of generative models. This allows global AI developers to leverage Albanian creative content without providing any economic return to the original authors.
- **The Transparency Gap:** Current norms do not require developers to disclose training datasets. This opacity effectively nullifies the possibility for creators to exercise “opt-out” rights or monitor the unauthorized use of their intellectual property.

These gaps create systemic risks, ranging from the **economic displacement** of local musicians and visual artists to the potential “**algorithmic dilution**” of Albanian cultural identity. Failure to address these gaps prevents Albania from aligning with the transparency standards set by the **EU AI Act** and risks marginalizing the domestic creative sector in a globalized digital market.

Comparative Insights and Normative Recommendations

Comparative data confirms that the “**human spark**” remains the global cornerstone of copyright. While the US and EU maintain this baseline, their frameworks struggle with the economic reality of AI training and the automation of creative processes. In Albania, the principle of human creativity is strictly upheld by Articles 8 and 9 of Law No. 35/2016; however, this adherence to traditional doctrine creates a paradox. The lack of specific protection against “**style-cloning**” leaves creators vulnerable to revenue loss without a clear path for legal recourse, as current law does not recognize the “imitation of aesthetic signature” as a compensable infringement.

The implementation of **limited-term sui generis rights (3–5 years)** is analyzed as a mechanism to incentivize investment in local AI development while preventing long-term monopolies over machine-generated content. However, as highlighted in critical literature (Gervais, 2020; Mantegna, 2024), such rights must be carefully calibrated to avoid detrimental outcomes.

There is a significant risk that *sui generis* protections could lead to “**copyright clutter**,” complicating the legal landscape and potentially devaluing human-authored works if the distinction between human and machine production is not strictly maintained. For Albania, this study suggests that any such right should be strictly limited in scope—focusing solely on preventing the **verbatim commercial copying** of autonomous AI outputs—rather than granting broad exclusionary rights that might stifle further innovation or public domain enrichment.

The case studies underscore the necessity of an **Input Liability Framework**. Drawing from French and Dutch experiments, Albania could implement a statutory levy or a collective licensing system managed by the ZSHDA. Such a framework would ensure that creators—particularly in the digital music and illustration sectors—receive fair remuneration when their intellectual labor feeds the growth of generative systems. This model transition from individual enforcement to collective management is essential in the AI era, where the scale of data ingestion makes individual litigation practically impossible for local artists.

Transparency is the prerequisite for any effective copyright enforcement in the AI era. Without a “look-behind-the-curtain” into training datasets, “opt-out” rights remain purely theoretical.

Practical Implications for Albania

- **Dataset Disclosure:** AI developers operating within the jurisdiction should be required to declare training sources. This allows artists to monitor the use of their “aesthetic signature” and enforce moral rights.
- **National Transparency Portal:** Establishing a centralized registry for training data could reduce legal disputes and build trust between the tech and creative communities.
- **Ethical Safeguards:** Enforcing standards that prohibit the algorithmic reproduction of national folk motifs (e.g., traditional polyphony or ethnographic patterns) without attribution, thereby protecting the integrity of Albania’s cultural heritage from “digital dilution.”

This structured approach balances the need for technological innovation with the non-negotiable protection of the creator’s economic and moral rights.

Drawing from international practices and addressing specific local challenges, a hybrid model is proposed for Albania to effectively balance the protection of authors with incentives for technological innovation. This model is structured around the following core pillars:

- **Human Authorship:** Copyright protection is maintained for works demonstrating significant human contribution. Legislation should clearly define “meaningful contribution,” such as the selection of prompts, substantive post-editing of AI outputs, or the curation of generated content. This aims to reduce legal disputes regarding eligibility in digital illustration, music, and literature.
- **Sui Generis Rights:** Temporary rights (3–5 years) are provided for fully autonomous AI-generated works. This protection is designed to prevent verbatim copying while avoiding the monopolization of general creative

ideas. The limited duration encourages innovation and ensures that such works eventually enter the public domain.

- **Input Compensation & Collective Licensing:** A statutory levy or collective licensing system should be implemented for works utilized in AI training. Organizations like the ZSHDA would manage the distribution of fees and the resolution of disputes, ensuring creators benefit economically from AI's use of their data.
- **Transparency & Opt-Out Mechanisms:** AI developers are required to disclose all datasets used for training. Creators must be allowed to opt out of dataset inclusion to ensure their work is not used without consent, aligning with EU AI Act standards.
- **Regional Collaboration & Cultural Preservation:** Albania should cooperate with neighboring countries (Kosovo, North Macedonia, Montenegro) to harmonize frameworks. Furthermore, standards must be created to ensure AI does not distort unique Albanian artistic styles, protecting national identity from algorithmic misrepresentation.

Benefits of the Hybrid Model

The implementation of this hybrid framework offers several key advantages:

1. **Economic:** Fair compensation models strengthen local creative industries.
2. **Cultural:** It provides a shield for unique Albanian artistic styles against unregulated replication.
3. **Innovation:** Legal certainty is provided for AI developers within a clear framework.
4. **Legal Harmonization:** The model aligns Albania with EU directives and WIPO guidelines, facilitating cross-border collaboration.

The adoption of a hybrid legal framework in Albania yields several strategic benefits designed to safeguard both the market and the national heritage:

- **Economic:** The establishment of fair compensation models strengthens local creative industries and provides the necessary incentives for investment in AI-driven art platforms.
- **Cultural:** This framework protects unique Albanian artistic styles from unregulated AI replication, thereby preserving national identity in the digital space.
- **Innovation:** By providing a clear legal pathway for AI developers, the proposed model reduces regulatory uncertainty and fosters technological experimentation.

- **Legal Harmonization:** The model aligns Albania with EU directives (AI Act) and WIPO guidelines, supporting the nation’s integration into global digital markets and the European Digital Single Market.

Failure to implement these reforms could result in significant economic losses, widespread cultural appropriation, and a decline in international competitiveness as AI adoption accelerates globally.

TABLE 2. Proposed Hybrid Model for Albania

The following table summarizes the key elements of the proposed hybrid model and their projected impact on the Albanian creative ecosystem:

Element	Description	Expected Outcome
Human Authorship	Maintain copyright protection for significant human contributions.	Guaranteed legal protection and recognition for human creators.
Sui Generis Rights	Limited-term (3–5 years) protection for fully autonomous AI-only works.	Encourages technological investment while preventing long-term monopolies.
Input Compensation	Implementation of a statutory levy or collective licensing systems.	Fair and transparent distribution of revenue to original creators.
Transparency & Opt-Out	Mandatory disclosure of AI training datasets.	Empowers creators to control their work and ensures ethical AI use.

Policy Recommendations and Conclusion

Based on the comparative analysis, case studies of AI-generated music and visual arts, and the rigorous evaluation of the limitations within Law No. 35/2016, this study proposes a strategic roadmap for legislative reform. The following measures are designed to harmonize Albanian law with the EU Acquis while fostering a sustainable digital creative economy:

- **Codifying “Meaningful Human Contribution”:** The Albanian Copyright Office (ZSHDA) should issue specific guidelines to interpret the human-centric requirement of Articles 8 and 9. Protection should remain strictly reserved for works where the “human spark” is evident. This involves establishing a threshold for copyrightability that recognizes tasks such as complex prompt engineering, transformative post-editing, and the intellectual curation of AI-generated outputs as valid forms of authorship, thereby reducing jurisdictional uncertainty for digital creators.
- **Establishment of a Sui Generis AI Framework:** To address the “protection vacuum” of fully autonomous AI outputs, Albania should introduce a *sui*

generis right. Unlike traditional copyright, this protection would be limited to a 3-to-5-year term, focusing exclusively on preventing unauthorized commercial exploitation (verbatim copying). This balanced approach incentivizes technological investment and ensures that machine-generated content rapidly enriches the public domain without devaluing the lifetime protection afforded to human artists.

- **Mandatory Collective Licensing and Statutory Levies:** In response to the “input liability” crisis, Albania must adopt a collective compensation model. Drawing inspiration from the French and Dutch implementations of the DSM Directive, the ZSHDA should oversee a system where AI developers pay a statutory levy for the ingestion of Albanian creative data. This mechanism ensures that local musicians and visual artists are remunerated when their intellectual labor contributes to the training of global generative models, effectively mitigating the “economic leakage” currently observed in the market.
- **Transparency Mandates and Dataset Disclosure:** In alignment with the **EU AI Act (2024)**, Albanian law should be amended to require high-level transparency from AI providers. This includes a mandatory disclosure of the datasets used for training. Such transparency is the only viable method for artists to exercise their “opt-out” rights and protect their “aesthetic signature” from algorithmic cloning. A centralized **National Transparency Portal** could serve as a bridge between the tech industry and the creative community.
- **Regional Harmonization and Chapter 7 Integration:** As Albania advances its EU integration process, it should lead a regional initiative with Kosovo, North Macedonia, and Montenegro to create a harmonized Balkan IP framework for AI. This would prevent “legal arbitrage” and ensure that the small but culturally rich Albanian market has a unified voice in international forums such as WIPO.

The implementation of the proposed hybrid model yields multi-dimensional benefits that address the current legal and economic precariousness in the Albanian creative sector:

- **Economic Impact:** The establishment of fair compensation models ensures that creators—particularly in the digital music and visual arts sectors—receive tangible remuneration for the use of their intellectual labor in AI training. By providing a clear legal pathway for both authors and developers, this framework encourages local investment in AI-driven creative platforms, fostering entrepreneurship and sustainable economic growth within Albania’s digital economy.
- **Cultural Impact:** This model serves as a vital shield for the Albanian artistic identity. By regulating the algorithmic replication of traditional

motifs and regional styles, the framework effectively mitigates the risk of uncontrolled AI-driven “cultural dilution.” It ensures that the nation’s heritage remains attributed, respected, and accessible, rather than being reduced to anonymous training data.

- **Innovation and Technological Growth:** Legal certainty is the prerequisite for investment. By clarifying the status of human-assisted and autonomous outputs, the proposed model reduces the risk for AI developers, encouraging responsible experimentation. The hybrid approach balances risk and reward, allowing for machine-driven innovation while maintaining the supremacy of human creative agency.
- **Legal Harmonization and International Alignment:** As Albania advances through the chapters of the EU *Acquis*, aligning national legislation with the **EU AI Act (2024)** and **WIPO** guidelines is a strategic necessity. This harmonization enhances cross-border collaboration and facilitates the integration of Albanian creators into the global digital market, ensuring they are not left behind in the international AI transition.
- **Ethical Considerations and Transparency:** Mandatory disclosure of training datasets promotes a culture of transparency and ethical AI usage. By protecting the moral rights of creators and ensuring that AI systems respect the “human spark,” Albania can position itself as a jurisdiction that prioritizes digital ethics alongside technological progress.

Conclusion

The rise of Generative AI (AI-G) presents unprecedented challenges for copyright law worldwide, including in Albania. Traditional frameworks emphasize human authorship but fail to address fully autonomous AI outputs and the complexities of input liability.

The comparative analysis conducted in this study demonstrates that:

1. **Human authorship** remains essential for copyright protection across the US, EU, and Albania.
2. ***Sui generis* rights** provide a viable model for the temporary protection of autonomous AI-generated works.
3. **Input compensation frameworks** are necessary to protect creators’ economic interests when AI systems utilize copyrighted material.
4. **Transparency and opt-out mechanisms** enhance fairness, reduce disputes, and ensure ethical AI practices.
5. **Regional and global collaboration** strengthens legal harmonization, innovation, and economic opportunities.

For Albania, a hybrid model—retaining human authorship protection, introducing *sui generis* rights, implementing collective licensing, ensuring transparency, and promoting regional cooperation—provides a robust and forward-looking solution. Implementing these measures will safeguard creators' rights, stimulate technological and artistic innovation, and promote sustainable economic growth. By proactively addressing AI-G challenges, Albania can emerge as a leader in ethical, innovative, and culturally aware AI-driven creative industries.

References

- Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works. (1971, September 28). *Paris Act*. World Intellectual Property Organization.
- Crowell & Moring LLP. (n.d.). *Major American music labels sue generative AI music platforms in first case of its kind over AI audio* [Practitioner Report]. Retrieved from <https://www.crowell.com/>
- Epstein, Z., Hertzmann, A., Akten, M., Farid, H., Fjeld, J., Frank, M. R., ... & Russakovsky, O. (2023). Art and the science of generative AI: A deeper dive. *arXiv preprint*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2306.04141>
- European Union. (2019). Directive (EU) 2019/790 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 April 2019 on copyright and related rights in the Digital Single Market. *Official Journal of the European Union*, L 130/92.
- Gendron, V. (2024). A new frontier: The music industry's struggle against generative AI. *University of Miami Business Law Review*, 33(1), 45-78.
- Gervais, D. J. (2022). Artificial intelligence and the creative double bind. *Seton Hall Law Review*, 52(4), 1073-1115.
- Idromeno, K. (1883). *Motra Tone* [Oil on canvas]. National Art Gallery of Albania, Tirana.
- Karas, A. (2024, February). *Inaugural music law summit explored the impact of generative AI on the music industry*. Vanderbilt Law School. Retrieved from [URL].
- Mantegna, M. (2024). ARTificial: Why copyright is not the right policy tool to deal with generative AI. *The Yale Law Journal Forum*, 133(4), 112-140.
- Ministria e Kulturës. (2024). *Raporti për politikat kulturore dhe inovacionin teknologjik në artet figurative dhe muzikë*. Tiranë: MK.
- Naren, N. (2024, May). *Unravelling the enigma: The quest for sui generis rights in AI creation*. Law School Policy Review.
- Perzanowski, M. (2024). Consent and compensation: Resolving generative AI's copyright crisis. *Virginia Law Review*, 110(4).
- Republika e Shqipërisë. (2016). *Ligji nr. 35/2016 "Për të drejtat e autorit dhe të drejtat e lidhura me të"*. Fletore Zyrtare e Republikës së Shqipërisë, nr. 64.
- U.S. Copyright Office. (2025). *Copyright and artificial intelligence, part 2: Copyrightability report*. Washington, DC: Library of Congress.
- Zyra Shqiptare për të Drejtat e Autorit (ZSHDA). (2024). *Udhëzime për mbrojtjen e veprave në epokën digjitale dhe përdorimin e inteligjencës artificiale*. Tiranë: ZSHDA.