

Harnessing Generative AI to Enhance Access to Online Dispute Resolution in Employment Law

Sarah Nason^{1,*}, Ebube G. Ogbonda², Jonathan C. Roberts² and Peter W. S. Butcher^{2,*}

¹*School of History, Law and Social Sciences, Bangor University, United Kingdom*

²*School of Computer Science and Engineering, Bangor University, United Kingdom*

Abstract

As part of the UK Government funded Regulators Pioneer Fund 3 project, Bangor University developed a prototype Web-based system to assess the effectiveness of Artificial Intelligence, specifically Large Language Models in facilitating the recommendation of appropriate Online Dispute Resolution tools to people with issues related to employment law. This paper explains the “EmployODR” prototype and matters raised in development and user testing, particularly as a catalyst for further discussion of generative AI’s promise in enhancing access to justice in employment law, and its potential use in mapping pathways to dispute resolution.

Keywords

Online Dispute Resolution, Justice, Employment Law, Artificial Intelligence, Large Language Models

1. Introduction

In 2016, the UK Government Lord Chancellor and Secretary of State for Justice, the Lord Chief Justice of England and Wales, and the Senior President of Tribunals, proposed to “transform” the justice system, premised on the need to “combine respected traditions with the enabling power of technology” [1]. This vision was based on principles of justice, proportionality, and accessibility. Over nearly ten years, His Majesty’s Courts and Tribunals Service (HMCTS) undertook an extensive reform programme to digitise services [2]. The programme has had varying successes, with its budget being increased alongside a reduction in scope [3, 4, 5]; its completion will not be the end of the modernisation journey [6]. Online Dispute Resolution (ODR) emerged as central to the “transformation” programme, and to future hopes for improving access to justice for individuals, especially in a climate where legal aid funded advice in the civil justice sector has been decimated [7, 8, 9, 10]. However, the concept of ODR remains insufficiently articulated, and the developing market for ODR tools is poorly understood and fragmented [11]. Whilst ODR first emerged in the ecommerce system to address consumer issues, [12, 13] it now encompasses a wide set of tools and techniques, supported by technology, aimed at facilitating conflict resolution [12, 14, 15]. The Covid-19 pandemic accelerated the institutionalisation of ODR, [12, 16] alongside expanding technological capacity, where AI-based prediction systems are increasingly used [17]. ODR has moved from largely online ADR (Alternative Dispute Resolution) to reimagining justice processes [12, 18].

Several UK Governments have seen an important role for regulators in the development of technology and the expansion of AI [19]. A Regulators Pioneer Fund (RPF) was set up in 2018, investing in regulator-led projects to stimulate innovation in their sectors [20, 21, 22]. In 2023, as part of the third round of RPF funding (RPF3), the Solicitors Regulation Authority (SRA), along with the England and Wales Law Society and a charity, the Access to Justice Foundation (ATJF), were awarded funding for a project on “Solving legal issues through technology” exploring how ODR can help tackle unmet legal need of individuals, consumers and micro/small enterprises [23]. The SRA is the independent regulatory body

AI for Access to Justice Workshop at the International Conference on AI and Law 2025, June 20, 2025, Chicago, Illinois, USA

*Corresponding author.

✉ s.nason@bangor.ac.uk (S. Nason); glory.ogbonda@bangor.ac.uk (E. G. Ogbonda); j.c.roberts@bangor.ac.uk (J. C. Roberts); p.butcher@bangor.ac.uk (P. W. S. Butcher)

ORCID 0000-0002-8308-3387 (S. Nason); 0009-0002-9781-7537 (E. G. Ogbonda); 0000-0001-7718-3181 (J. C. Roberts); 0000-0002-3361-627X (P. W. S. Butcher)



© 2025 Copyright for this paper by its authors. Use permitted under Creative Commons License Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0).

for solicitors and law firms in England and Wales. The Law Society is the independent professional body for solicitors in England and Wales.

The project involved desk-based research to understand current ODR provision, gaps and opportunities, and an engagement phase including service providers, developers, consumers, legal professionals, and public bodies. The ATJF led work to engage with users and providers, particularly around barriers to accessing ODR. Some key learning from the AJTF work has been that non-court based dispute resolution risks embedding existing exclusions; that existing technology mainly provides platforms that enable ODR as a process not as a service and that these processes are not well tailored for marginalised communities; ODR platforms cannot replace tailored legal guidance; frontline providers continue to play a crucial role including preventing disputes arising and signposting and supporting the use of ODR tools; and that hybrid and user-centred design is crucial [11]. The wider work of the SRA and Law Society is expected to be published by summer 2025.

As part of the RPF3 project, Bangor University developed a prototype Web-based system to assess the effectiveness of AI, specifically Large Language Models (LLMs) in facilitating the recommendation of appropriate ODR tools to people with issues related to employment law. The choice to focus on employment law as a case-study was made in consultation with all project partners, based on matters such as the relative “vulnerability” [24] of those who might seek to use and benefit from such a tool, and the availability of a sufficient range of ODR tools on which to test the prototype developed.

The aims of this paper are to explain the “EmployODR” prototype and the issues raised in development and user testing, particularly using this as a catalyst for further discussion of the promise of generative AI for enhancing access to justice in employment law, and its potential use in mapping pathways to dispute resolution.

2. The “EmployODR” prototype and ODR tools

2.1. The Prototype

The prototype developed comprises a chatbot, accessed via a Web front-end built with ReactJS¹. Our front-end communicates with the OpenAI API, using the GPT 3.5 Turbo Large Language Model (LLM)².

Web applications are ubiquitous, accessible on an ever-growing number of consumer devices. They are economical to develop, maintain, and deploy. As more consumer facing services move online, there is more demand for digital systems that deliver efficient access to accurate legal information. Though there are challenges behind developing any digital system, a system that uses generative AI poses new and interesting challenges. Generative AI, especially LLMs, can be compared to an over-enthusiastic colleague who will always confidently answer your questions, but with outdated knowledge. These models are based on static data and have a knowledge cut-off date. A generative AI tool that aims to provide recommendations based on a person’s legal issues could run into problems where knowledge of recent changes in legislation is not available. The current global wave of interest in generative AI does mean however that new and improved models are released frequently with updated knowledge.

To further help ensure the information returned to the client is as accurate as possible, the prototype uses Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) using both human-curated data and a custom model to influence the LLM into returning contextually relevant information. Our RAG system contributes the following information into this process:

- A static dataset of 8 ODR tools and associated meta data, provided by the SRA during development. These ODR tools are specifically relevant to employment law.
- A predefined categories database, e.g.: wrongful termination, discrimination, contracts of employment, etc. into which the LLM should classify the questions it is asked. This database was compiled using a custom Python model from a web-scrape of thousands of frequently asked questions. These categories allow us to assess the relevance of client prompts, ask follow-up triage

¹<https://react.dev>

²<https://openai.com/index/gpt-3-5-turbo-fine-tuning-and-api-updates>

questions in certain situations, for example where there is a time restriction. This categorisation also affects the eventual recommendation of ODR tools.

- Jurisdictional context and the expected structure of the response, e.g. prompting for:
 - A summary of the conversation.
 - Relevant laws in England and Wales.
 - Suggested onward pathways and their possible outcomes.

The prototype helps to reduce the potential for hallucinations by examining the prompt and responses, performing keyword searches based on our categories database. Furthermore, our chatbot will only ever respond by asking a question with the intent of extracting more contextually relevant information from the client, it won't answer questions directly. The context gathered from the question-and-answer phase is used to generate a summary with a prescribed structure. To help contextualise the ODR tool recommendations that the prototype makes, we generate a summary of the client's conversation citing relevant laws in England and Wales, suggest onward pathways (e.g. internal resolution, early conciliation, trade union, etc.), and provide information on any relevant deadlines.

Two separate in-person workshops were conducted to assess the legal accuracy and usability of the prototype. 11 participants were recruited in total with 4 attending the first (hosted at the SRA offices in London) with sessions lasting up to 60-minutes, and 5 attending the second (hosted at Bangor University, and Citizens Advice Flintshire, Mold) with sessions lasting up to 90-minutes. The first workshop focussed on the legal accuracy of the outputs from the prototype given prompts of the participants' choosing. The second workshop considered both legal accuracy and the overall usability of the prototype. After each of the workshops, the user interface and RAG system were refined based on the feedback and issues faced by participants.

Workshop participants included solicitors specialising in employment law (those acting for individuals, and those acting for employers of varying sizes); Citizens Advice advisors, including specialists in employment law; University Law Clinic and Law Centre advisors, and others specialising in Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) practices including mediation. The following sections discuss some of the wider learning from the workshops.

3. The ODR tools

The 8 ODR tools selected by the SRA for inclusion in the prototype were:

- **The Advisory, Conciliation and Arbitration Service (ACAS)**³ – provides free and impartial information and advice on all aspects of workplace relations and employment law, benefiting both employees and employers seeking to improve workplace relations.
- **Valla**⁴ – is a comprehensive tool that helps employees handle workplace issues by providing extensive guidance and resources on employment law.
- **Shake**⁵ – an independent settlement negotiation platform for parties with financial disputes.
- **Resolve Disputes Online**⁶ – facilitates online mediation and dispute resolution, providing a streamlined process for resolving employment disputes with professional mediators and legal resources.
- **Grapple**⁷ – facilitates mediation and provides resources for resolving conflicts between employees and employers, making it ideal for resolving interpersonal conflicts and contract disputes within the workplace.

³<https://www.acas.org.uk/about-us/what-we-do>

⁴<https://valla.uk>

⁵<https://www.shake-legal.com>

⁶<https://resolvedisputes.online>

⁷<https://www.monacosolicitors.co.uk/blog/grapple>

- **Lawbite**⁸ – offers legal advice and services specifically for small businesses, including assistance with employment disputes.
- **Ajuve**⁹ - provides online dispute resolution services with a focus on employment related issues.
- **Contend Legal**¹⁰ - offers tools and resources for resolving legal disputes, including employment cases

4. Key themes raised in the testing workshops

4.1. Understanding ODR and the purpose of the prototype

An initial issue raised was the assumption that people understand the term ODR. Whereas those working and researching in this space have a clearer understanding, for many practitioners ODR is often understood in a narrow sense of comprising platforms for resolving disputes online, and it would here be misleading for users to think that this prototype provides such a platform. At its widest, “ODR tools” could mean any online sources that may assist people in resolving disputes, this then expands to any websites providing legal information, public legal education sites, advice provider websites, government websites, as well as the specific tools currently embedded in the prototype which mostly provide more active help and support with the resolution of existing or emerging disputes. Participants suggested avoiding use of the acronym ODR and instead referring to, “tools that might help you” or “websites that might help you” or just “recommendations for you” etc. The broader learning here, as the AJTF also found, [11] is that ODR remains little understood among the wider legal and adjacent professions, and among the public as potential users. Most of the ODR tools used in the prototype were not previously known to the workshop participants, despite most having specialist knowledge of employment law.

4.2. Legal accuracy and the legislation/case-law nexus

Early on there were some issues around legal accuracy, including the legal jurisdiction of responses. We were able to reduce or eliminate most legal inaccuracy through adjusting the RAG system, but this then increased the extent of human curation required. Of note were the different approaches of the private practice lawyers testing the system, as compared to the access to justice and dispute resolution professionals. In short, the specialist private practice lawyers wanted to beat or break the tool, the access to justice professionals were more concerned with how they and/or the public might use it. What we mean by beat or break is that the private practice lawyers were concerned primarily with the legal accuracy of the tool and its ability to provide correct legal answers to complex and multilayered legal problems. For the most part the prototype was able to provide relevant and correct legal analysis even in response to complex problems. Generally, if a user has given information indicating more than one employment law problem, the prototype was able to recognise this in legal analysis and recommendations, including related legal matters such as immigration status.

Where the prototype tended to struggle was in diagnosing legal rights under common law, such as potential claims for wrongful dismissal, and in recognising that breach of employment law rights can also constitute a breach of contract at common law, and where a user may potentially be able to simultaneously or alternatively take action in the County Courts. Generative AI alone was not always able to recognise potential County Court claims or the difference in limitation periods and costs implications of such claims as compared to an Employment Tribunal. Information about statutory employment law rights is more widely available online, whereas available information about common law principles may be more limited, and, despite recent advances [25], the UK remains behind several other common law nations when it comes to comprehensive publication of judgments for free online.

⁸<https://www.lawbite.co.uk>

⁹<https://ajuve.com>

¹⁰<https://contend.legal>

The primary purpose of this prototype is to assess the effectiveness of AI, specifically LLMs in facilitating the recommendation of appropriate ODR tools to people with issues related to employment law. As such the level of legal analysis provided is only that which is sufficient to enable a user to gain a general appreciation of their legal issue or issues, enough for the system to recommend the most appropriate ODR tools from its suite based on matter such as relevant to the problem, cost and accessibility. Generally, for all users, the prototype provides a summary of the legal issue, states the key legislation that is likely relevant, and gives a set of recommended actions or options. The prototype does not extend to providing more detailed legal analysis (i.e., identifying and explaining relevant sections of legislation, or citing relevant case law), and it does not seek to assist a user in developing a legal claim or in assessing the strength of a legal claim. This additional extensive legal analysis would require significantly more human curation and is unlikely to provide accurate advice given the current limitations of open AI. There are also particular challenges with employment law, as Employment Tribunals do not follow a system of precedent as such, and even where there are relevant legal tests, much will turn on the facts of individual disputes. Previous research in other legal jurisdictions has investigated the use of AI in determining worker status in employment law, showing that “off the shelf” AI models could classify cases with substantial accuracy, and that there were consistent patterns to the occasions of misclassifications by most algorithms. This revealed valuable conclusions about how equity is ensured by judges in legally ambiguous cases. However, OpenAI was not used, rather the data (for Canadian and Californian court cases) was collected, annotated and structured by the researchers [26].

4.3. Triage: manual input versus generative AI

The approach we have taken is to use a chatbot that will only ever respond by asking a question with the intent of extracting more contextually relevant information from the client, it won’t answer questions directly. The context gathered from the question-and-answer phase is used to generate a summary with a prescribed structure. This approach has the potential to avoid asking the user a series of potentially off-putting “triage” questions that are nevertheless central to employment law, such as when the problem with their employment arose, how long they have worked for their employer, what is the size of their employing organisation, and a series of questions seeking to determine their employment status (employee, worker, or self-employed). Without additional curation, the prototype was not able, through generative AI alone, to recognise the relevance of timing with 100% accuracy, it had to be prompted to ask for this information from all users, and also had to be prompted to ensure that questions relating to determining employment status were always asked where such were relevant to the problem(s). This was a matter much discussed in testing, for example, that manually inputting a set of key triage questions would ensure crucial information on facts such as timing is always collected, but the more manual input needed, the less the system operates on generative AI. Hence, we determined that there are still notable challenges with the effectiveness of AI, specifically LLMs here, if manual input is needed to ensure an appropriate degree of accuracy.

4.4. The importance of plain English and empathy

Key feedback was the importance of non-formal English. Participants said the system should be sensitive too and seek to mirror the language of the user. As discussed below in section 3.6, it was felt that members of the general public could use the tool, as well as advisors and that the same plain English should be used in both contexts. This is in part because it would help professional users (primarily advisors, triage admin staff) to better understand and engage with the person experiencing the problems. Participants also suggested that there is value to the system responding empathetically to the problems users report, e.g., “i’m sorry to hear about your problem at work”, “i’m sorry to hear that you are having difficulties with your manager” etc. Notably, whilst the need for holistic human-centred advice is often given as a reason against the extensive use of ODR tools [27], here the language of the prototype can be adjusted to coax professionals into using more empathetic and plain English language.

4.5. The pervasive value of “guided pathways” and the promise of “explanatory visualisation”

People are looking directly for solutions to their problems, whereas this prototype is primarily about signposting to ODR tools. From several participants there was more interest in, and a perceived greater need for, tools that guide users through potential pathways to resolution. Based on the information provided about the ODR tools, the current prototype performed well in recommending appropriate tools from the suite available. However, again, several participants were most interested in the recommended actions suggested by the prototype, particularly those actions that could or should be taken prior to or concurrently with more formal dispute resolution, such as discussing matters informally with colleagues, speaking to a manager, and following internal grievance procedures. Participants appreciated the prototype’s potential for informing users of the different steps that a user can take to help resolve their problem, which of these are sequential, and which are concurrent, and what time limits apply. Several participants recommended this could be best communicated in a visual, tabular or graphic form. There was some discussion of whether users should always be presented with all options, which includes “do nothing”. Several participants, particularly in the advice sector, considered that users should always be presented with all options, and that “do nothing” could be better phrased as “accept that situation” (which is more empowering language). Another key point was that the prototype should identify and inform the user as quickly as possible actions they cannot take; where routes are closed off either due to the nature of the problem, the employment status of the user, or an issue of timing. Many of these issues relate more to mapping or pathways tools, with which we have past experience. For example, our previous tool “Artemus”, is an explanatory visualisation tool for aspects of administrative justice, specifically focusing on case-studies in housing and education law [28].

In previous work we noted that one cannot plug a visualisation tool into a database, as there is no such single database of information. Legal principles are complex, information is held across various layers of legislation and case-law, and discernment is needed to distinguish between law and policy, rules and discretionary decision-making. In administrative justice the “system” of institutions and remedies has grown up piecemeal, presenting the individual with several different bodies, processes and laws [29]. In developing the explanatory visualisation tool, Artemus, we used a collaborative co-design method, which allowed us time to reflect and gain ongoing feedback from stakeholders. With Artemus, people start at a redress point of interest and build a personal journey by choosing routes of redress. We continue to experiment with the extent to which AI can be utilised to effectively automate parts of the visualisation process.

The workshops testing the “EmployODR” demonstrated demand for tools more like Artemus which maps pathways to redress. Participants in the present workshops were also particularly interested in whether it would be possible for the prototype to list several factors that might guide a user’s choice about what action to take (e.g. around comparative costs of tribunals and courts, the amount of compensation that might be recovered, factors that might impact on the relief available, whether a user ideally wants to remain in their job, whether it is possible for a dismissed employee/worker to be reinstated and so on). Again, there are limitations in the extent to which information of this kind could be reliably constructed via generative AI. Advice providers pointedly noted that these are considerations that would generally be discussed as part of providing more “holistic” human-centred advice. A wider consideration for Artemus and “EmployODR” has been the need to ensure that what is provided is information and not legal or otherwise regulated advice. The more such tools delve into the comparative costs and benefits of courses of action, the more they risk straying into providing advice outside of an appropriately regulated context.

4.6. AI generated recommendations cannot replace ‘holistic’ advice

Most participants in the workshops found the recommendations for action/options for the user especially useful. Where participants considered the tool would be of most use is in the “triage” or “gateway” stage of an advice journey, considering that a triage or gateway administrator or trainee advisor could use

the prototype alongside the user, both to help the user better understand the issue they might be facing, and to provide a summary analysis and recommendations to then be passed to the more specialist advisor. This has the potential to improve efficiency and reduce costs for advice services, as well as empowering individuals. Several participants felt that the general public could use the prototype to gain an initial understanding of whether their problem is one that relates to legal rights and entitlements, and that it could assist in avoiding the escalation of disputes due to its recommendations around informal resolution, whilst also educating people about important steps to take and when to take them if it does appear that they may have a legal claim.

However, access to justice sector participants noted that whilst the prototype was able to diagnose directly connected legal issues (i.e., employment and immigration), unlike an advice worker, it does not delve into detailed questioning about the person and their situation to provide “holistic” advice on other issues such as debt, housing, or family issues.

5. An example usage scenario of "EmployODR"

An example of a typical user-flow through "EmployODR" is shown in Figure 1.

1 User enters their problem/issue

I'm not getting on with my boss, I think he's giving me easy, boring work because I'm getting older. I think they are laying some people off soon, this is worrying me a lot.

2 Follow up questions and user responses

EN Show recommendation Export as PDF

Tell me more about the interactions you've had with your boss that lead you to believe you're receiving easy, boring work because of your age. When did this happen?

He gives me jobs that are too easy for my skills, it makes me worry I'm not valued, this has been happening regularly over the last few months.

EN Show recommendation Export as PDF

How has your communication with your boss been lately? Tell me more.

3 Summary and recommendations

Based on what you have told me, I have generated the following summary and recommendations. This recommendation does not constitute legal advice:

Based on the conversation you've shared, it appears that you are facing potential age discrimination issues at your workplace. Your concerns about your boss giving you easy, boring work because of your age, coupled with the fear of potential layoffs, are valid and troubling. Here's a breakdown of the situation and steps you can consider:

1. The Issue:
You believe that your boss is assigning you mundane tasks due to your age, which makes you feel undervalued. Additionally, the looming possibility of layoffs adds to your distress.

2. Overview:
Your repeated assignments of tasks below your skill level, along with the context of potential layoffs, raise concerns of age discrimination and unfair treatment in the workplace.

3. Relevant Laws:
In England and Wales, the Equality Act 2010 protects employees from discrimination based on various characteristics, including age. Age discrimination can occur in various forms, such as in recruitment, training, promotions, and dismissals.

4. Pathways to Consider:

- Informal Resolution:** Consider having an open conversation with your boss about your concerns. It might be a misunderstanding that could be resolved through communication.
- Formal Grievance:** If the issue persists, you can raise a formal grievance internally following your company's grievance procedure. This would involve lodging a written complaint to HR or a designated person within your organization.
- ACAS Early Conciliation:** Before taking legal action, you could engage in early conciliation through ACAS, a free and impartial service that helps resolve workplace disputes. This step is mandatory before lodging a claim with an employment tribunal.

4 Possible outcomes

5. Possible Outcomes:

- Informal Resolution:** Your boss may not have been aware of how their actions were perceived, and this conversation could lead to a positive change in your work assignments.
- Formal Grievance:** If you raise a formal grievance, the company would need to investigate your concerns, and appropriate actions should be taken to address the issue.
- ACAS Early Conciliation:** Engaging in early conciliation can lead to a settlement agreement or a clearer understanding of your rights and options before considering legal action.

Given the nature of your concerns and the potential legal implications, engaging in early conciliation through ACAS would be a recommended first step. This process can help facilitate communication between you and your employer to resolve the matter efficiently and effectively while considering your rights and the legal framework in place.

Remember, there are time limits for bringing claims to an employment tribunal (usually within 3 months less one day from the date of the last discriminatory act), so it's essential to address your concerns promptly.

5 Recommendation of legal tools

Legal Tools You Can Use

Based on your legal issue, here are the top 3 recommended ODR tools:

1. ACAS

- Relevance Score: 9/10
- Cost: Free
- Ease of Use: Easy
- Success Rate: High
- Legal Support Available: ✓ Yes
- Description: ACAS provides free and impartial information and advice to employers and employees on all aspects of workplace relations and employment law.
- Link to Tool: [Visit Tool](#)

2. Grapple

- Relevance Score: 8/10
- Cost: Free / Paid for professional mediators
- Ease of Use: Easy
- Success Rate: Positive
- Legal Support Available: ✓ Yes
- Description: Grapple is a platform designed for efficient dispute resolution in the workplace, facilitating mediation and providing resources for resolving conflicts between employees and employers.
- Link to Tool: [Visit Tool](#)

3. Resolve Disputes Online (RDO)

- Relevance Score: 7/10
- Cost: Varies
- Ease of Use: Medium
- Success Rate: High
- Legal Support Available: ✓ Yes
- Description: Resolve Disputes Online is a platform that facilitates online mediation and dispute resolution, aiming to provide a streamlined and effective process for resolving employment disputes.
- Link to Tool: [Visit Tool](#)

[Click here for more information about the recommended tools](#)

Figure 1: An example of "EmployODR": 1) A user enters their problem/issue into a text box. 2) "EmployODR" asks follow-up questions and waits for responses until it thinks it has enough information to display a recommendation. 3) An example of the legal summary and suggested pathways. 4) A summary of the possible outcomes. 5) ODR and legal tool recommendations with links to further information.

6. Concluding reflections

For now, generative AI alone cannot convincingly replicate the humanity and empathy of face-to-face advice, nor can it provide fully holistic advice, or even accurately map pathways to redress without significant manual collation and curation of legal data. With the present prototype, the generated legal summaries were praised by most participants, demonstrating the potential of generative AI for context driven information gathering in the employment law space. Many of the criticisms of generative AI are around hallucinations where the response to a prompt is confidently inaccurate. By restricting the LLM to only accept prompts that are related to employment law (through intent analysis), and to ask follow-up questions or generate summaries and recommendations based on the context it has been given by our RAG model and a user, rather than giving direct answers to questions, we can reduce the risk of hallucinations. The prototype successfully generated contextually relevant summaries and cited relevant laws. It was also good at using the context it had learned to signpost to relevant ODR tools. Participants generally liked the presentation of the ODR tools and found the information clear, particularly comparisons on matters of cost and accessibility. They considered it valuable that such tools would effectively be those in some way “endorsed” by the SRA, and that this improves confidence in the

authenticity of the tools recommended. However, this also raises issues that were beyond the scope of our contribution to the overall RPF3 project, including how the ODR tools provided for inclusion in the prototype were chosen, and that they are mostly not regulated by the SRA; questions could be raised about the SRA's independence if it is seen to be endorsing certain tools over others. This matter would need to be addressed if an ODR recommendation system of this kind were developed further, whereas the present RPF3 project has been focused on proof of concept and the potential of ODR. The AJTF has also concluded that there is a further need to explore the provision of centralised guidance and signposting relating to ODR tools, so that users are aware of their options and can easily find and filter services that are accredited and best placed to support the resolution of their disputes. "EmployODR" goes some way to demonstrating how such a system could work. The wider RPF3 project also examines the potential for standards, benchmarks and accreditation processes for ODR tools.

If the current proliferation of ODR continues apace, in terms of the number of platforms and tools, the use of AI, and the potential to move from automation to a re-imagining of our concepts of justice and of dispute resolution, there will be a clear need for authoritative and reliable systems that can guide and/or signpost users to the most appropriate tools for their needs. Achieving such requires a quick and cost-effective analysis of a person's potential legal problems, and "EmployODR" has demonstrated the great potential for generative AI in achieving this with a high degree of legal accuracy. However, it has also exposed the pervasive interest in tools that can visually map out holistic individual pathways to the resolution of disputes, reiterating the importance of co-design to focus on the services people most need.

Acknowledgments

This research was funded by the UK Government, Department of Science, Innovation and Technology as part of the Regulators Pioneer Fund Project 3. The views expressed are those of the authors and not of the UK Government or other project partners (project partners being, the Solicitors Regulation Authority, Law Society and Access to Justice Foundation).

Declaration on Generative AI

The author(s) have not employed any Generative AI tools.

References

- [1] The Lord Chancellor, The Lord Chief Justice, and The Senior President of Tribunals, Transforming our justice system, 2016. URL: <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5a803d9ae5274a2e8ab4f019/joint-vision-statement.pdf>, accessed: May 2025.
- [2] UK Ministry of Justice, Guidance: Modernising courts and tribunals: benefits of digital services, 2025. URL: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/modernising-courts-and-tribunals-benefits-of-digital-services>, accessed: May 2025.
- [3] House of Commons Committee of Public Accounts, Transforming courts and tribunals: progress review - second report of session 2019 (hc 27, 2019), 2019. URL: <https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201919/cmselect/cmpubacc/27/27.pdf>, accessed: May 2025.
- [4] House of Commons Committee of Public Accounts, Progress on the courts and tribunals reform programme - sixty-first report of session 2022–23 (hc 2002), 2023. URL: <https://committees.parliament.uk/publications/40649/documents/198166/default/>, accessed: May 2025.
- [5] National Audit Office, Progress on the courts and tribunals reform programme - session 2022-23 (hc 1130), 2023. URL: <https://www.nao.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2023/02/progress-on-courts-and-tribunals-reform-programme-1.pdf>, accessed: May 2025.
- [6] N. Goodwin, A digital revolution on justice: Looking back and moving forward, 2025. URL: <https://www.lawgazette.co.uk/commentary-and-opinion/>

a-digital-revolution-in-justice-looking-back-and-moving-forward/5122774.article, accessed: May 2025.

- [7] J. Organ, J. Sigafoos, The impact of laspo on routes to justice, 2018. URL: <https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/sites/default/files/the-impact-of-laspo-on-routes-to-justice-september-2018.pdf>, accessed: May 2025.
- [8] The Law Society Futures & Insights Team, Civil legal aid: A review of its sustainability and the challenges to its viability, 2021. URL: <https://www.lawsociety.org.uk/topics/research/civil-sustainability-review>, accessed: May 2025.
- [9] J. Robins, D. Newman, Justice in a Time of Austerity: Stories From a System in Crisis, Bristol University Press, 2021.
- [10] E. Palmer, T. Cornford, Y. Marique, A. Guinchard, Access to Justice: Beyond the Policies and Politics of Austerity, Bloomsbury Hart Publishing, 2016.
- [11] The Access to Justice Foundation, Embedding effective online dispute resolution for communities, 2025. URL: <https://atjf.org.uk/embedding-effective-odr-for-communities>, accessed: May 2025.
- [12] O. Rabinovich-Einy, The past, present, and future of online dispute resolution, Current Legal Problems 74 (2021) 125–148. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1093/clp/cuab004>. doi:10.1093/clp/cuab004. arXiv:<https://academic.oup.com/clp/article-pdf/74/1/125/41974110/cuab004.pdf>.
- [13] E. Katsh, O. Rabinovich-Einy, Digital justice: technology and the internet of disputes, Oxford University Press, 2017.
- [14] D. Carneiro, P. Novais, F. Andrade, J. Zeleznikow, J. Neves, Online dispute resolution: an artificial intelligence perspective, Artificial Intelligence Review 41 (2014) 211–240.
- [15] OECD, Oecd online dispute resolution framework, 2024. URL: https://www.oecd.org/content/dam/oecd/en/publications/reports/2024/10/oecd-online-dispute-resolution-framework_e88b6c6a/325e6edc-en.pdf, accessed: May 2025.
- [16] N. Byrom, S. Beardon, A. Kendrick, The impact of covid-19 measures on the civil justice system (2020).
- [17] G. Vos, The future for dispute resolution: Horizon scanning, 2022. URL: <https://www.judiciary.uk/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/MR-to-SCL-Sir-Brain-Neill-Lecture-2022-The-Future-for-Dispute-Resolution-Horizon-Scannings-.pdf>, accessed: May 2025.
- [18] H. Alessa, The role of artificial intelligence in online dispute resolution: A brief and critical overview, Information & Communications Technology Law 31 (2022) 319–342.
- [19] M. Clifford, Ai opportunities action plan, 2025. URL: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/ai-opportunities-action-plan>, accessed: May 2025.
- [20] Department for Business & Trade, Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy, Projects selected for the regulator’s pioneer fund (2021), 2022. URL: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/projects-selected-for-the-regulators-pioneer-fund/projects-selected-for-the-regulators-pioneer-fund>, accessed: May 2025.
- [21] Department for Business & Trade, Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy, Projects selected for the regulator’s pioneer fund (2022), 2022. URL: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/projects-selected-for-the-regulators-pioneer-fund/projects-selected-for-the-regulators-pioneer-fund-2022>, accessed: May 2025.
- [22] Department for Business & Trade, Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy, Notice: Regulators’ pioneer fund: round 3), 2022. URL: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/apply-for-the-regulators-pioneer-fund-round-3>, accessed: May 2025.
- [23] Solicitors Regulation Authority, Solving legal issues through technology, 2024. URL: <https://www.sra.org.uk/solicitors/resources/innovate/solving-legal-issues-technology/>, accessed: May 2025.
- [24] D. Newman, J. Mant, F. Gordon, Vulnerability, legal need and technology in england and wales, International Journal of Discrimination and the Law 21 (2021) 230–253.
- [25] Ministry of Justice, HM Courts & Tribunals Service, and J. Cartlidge, Press release: Court judgments made accessible to all at the national archives, 2022. URL: <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/court-judgments-made-accessible-to-all-at-the-national-archives>.

- [26] M. C. Cohen, S. Dahan, W. Khern-Am-Nuai, H. Shimao, J. Touboul, The use of ai in legal systems: determining independent contractor vs. employee status, *Artificial intelligence and law* (2023) 1–30.
- [27] N. W. Spaulding, Online dispute resolution and the end of adversarial justice, *Legal Tech and the Future of Civil Justice*, *supra* note 68 (2023).
- [28] J. C. Roberts, P. Butcher, A. Sherlock, S. Nason, Explanatory journeys: Visualising to understand and explain administrative justice paths of redress, *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics* 28 (2021) 518–528.
- [29] S. Nason, Oversight of administrative justice systems, in: *Oxford Handbook of Administrative Justice*, Oxford: OUP, 2021.