Contract Automation and Contract Innovation in Alternative Dispute Resolution ("ADR") for Startup Companies

By

Dr. Sherif Mohsen Abdel Fattah Shaltout

Abstract

Title of Research: Contract Automation and Contract Innovation in Alternative Dispute Resolution for Startup Companies.

This study provides a critical analysis of the UNCITRAL Model Law on Automated Contracting (MLAC), examining both its transformative potential and inherent challenges in modern dispute resolution for startups. While MLAC establishes a robust framework for AI-driven contracts and machine-to-machine transactions—enhancing efficiency, reducing errors, and promoting global consistency—it also reveals significant gaps in addressing systemic risks, algorithmic transparency, and equitable remedies. Challenges such as the rigidity of code execution, liability attribution in unexpected outcomes (e.g., Quoine v. B2C2), and the tension between automated systems and traditional legal doctrines underscore the need for iterative legal updates.

The research highlights how Legal Design Thinking complements MLAC by improving contract usability and fostering collaborative relationships through user-centric design principles. However, integrating these methodologies requires alignment with business strategies, such as value proposition models and SWOT analysis, to balance innovation with risk mitigation. Case studies illustrate persistent challenges, including the limitations of MLAC's attribution framework in resolving disputes arising from asymmetric bargaining power and algorithmic opacity.

This study highlights the pivotal role of the Chief Legal Innovation Officer in bridging the gaps between automation and human oversight, advocating for a balanced approach that enhances algorithmic accountability and equitable safeguards while prioritizing innovation and legal fairness in startup ecosystems.

Table of Abbreviations

API	Application Program Interface
IDE	Innovation driven entrepreneurs
UI	User Interface
UX	User Experience
CLIO	Chief legal Innovation officer
UNCITRAL	United Nations Commission on International Trade Law
SGCA	Singapore Court of Appeal
MLEC	UNCITRAL Model Law on Electronic Commerce
MLAC	Model Law for automating contracts
CLM	Contract Life Cycle Management
NDA	Non-disclosure Agreement
SME	Small and medium Enterprise
AI	Artificial Intelligence
HFT	High Frequency Trading
LDT	Legal Design Thinking
GDPR	General Data Protection Regulation
CCPA	California Consumer Privacy Act
AR	Augmented Reality

Problem Description

Digital contract management faces complexities due to automated systems and legal ambiguities. Machine-driven contracting, using AI-generated clauses, creates a gap between efficiency and equitable dispute resolution. Hyperconnected platforms increase opacity risks by obscuring obligations in technical syntax. This dissonance is pronounced in mobile-first commerce. Non-specialist stakeholders are vulnerable to algorithmic determinations.

The legal framework for automated contracts is fragmented across jurisdictions, struggling to balance code with fairness doctrines. Real-world implementations reveal tensions, such as accommodating equitable remedies for mistakes. The UNCITRAL Model Law on Automated Contracting (MLAC) offers a solution but may perpetuate power imbalances. MLAC prioritizes transactional finality over adaptive justice mechanisms.

Manual contracting paradigms struggle with version control and negotiation cycles, faltering against the growth of digital transactions. Legacy systems create compliance issues in API-driven ecosystems. Dynamic pricing and self-amending agreements operate in regulatory uncertainty. Mobile platforms require contracts to become more accessible and multimodal.

Innovation-driven enterprises face deepening crises due to algorithmic contracting liabilities. Startups using high-frequency trading (HFT)-style

algorithms risk significant exposure when black-box systems produce aberrant outputs, as seen in Singapore's cryptocurrency arbitration cases. The MLAC's attribution provisions highlight doctrinal dissonance regarding machine learning models evolving beyond training parameters. The lack of standardized disclosure protocols for autonomous agents creates adversarial environments in Web3 marketplaces.

Contract automation streamlines processes using AI-driven templates but lacks human-centric innovation. Automated systems prioritize efficiency over user needs, often disregarding contextual barriers. AI-generated contracts may not address power imbalances or linguistic accessibility, leading to disputes. This oversight leaves automation tools unable to resolve issues like algorithmic opacity. The omission of empathize and define phases exacerbates these gaps, as seen in cases like Quoine v B2C2.

Contract automation often overlooks the creative and iterative process of legal design, relying on static templates rather than co-created solutions with end-users. This approach stifles innovation and perpetuates legacy structures that can disadvantage marginalized groups. As a result, automated contracts remain transactional rather than evolving into strategic relationship-building tools.

This study evaluates the interplay between automated contracting and human-centered legal innovation, aiming to integrate computational efficiency with equitable design. It examines the limitations of contract

automation paradigms, particularly the UNCITRAL MLAC. Case studies like Quoine v B2C2 highlight MLAC's shortcomings in disputes involving AI agency. The study assesses gaps in safeguarding vulnerable stakeholders, such as mobile platform users with limited digital literacy. It seeks to propose more equitable contracting frameworks.

This research applies Legal Design Thinking's (LDT) five-phase methodology to contract automation to bridge innovation gaps. It uses empathy-driven analysis to identify accessibility flaws in AI-generated templates. Iterative prototyping of multimodal interfaces can mitigate disputes from standardized terms. A comparative analysis contrasts automation's rigidity with design thinking's collaborative approach. This evaluates metrics like dispute reduction and user comprehension gains.

This study pioneers also frameworks for Chief Legal Innovation Officers to harmonize automation with strategic innovation. It evaluates roadmaps for embedding ethical AI guardrails into self-executing agreements. The research aligns adaptive compliance with business objectives using value proposition models. It proposes a hybrid paradigm combining computational efficiency with participatory design principles. This ensures contracts evolve as both legal instruments and trust-building tools.

Introduction

The legal tech industry saw significant growth in 2022, with investments over $3.4 billion, focusing on areas like contract automation. This shift is crucial for managing high volumes of contracts efficiently, as manual processes can lead to burnout. Contract automation enhances efficiency, accuracy, and productivity in legal operations (Agarwal, 2023).The current UNCITRAL MLAC provides a legal framework to enable the use of automation in international contracts, including the deployment of artificial intelligence techniques, smart contracts, and machine-to-machine transactions. This model law is designed to complement and supplement existing laws on electronic transactions, particularly those based on other UNCITRAL electronic commerce texts (UNCITRAL, 2024).

The primary focus of the UNCITRAL MLAC is on the technical and legal aspects of automating contract processes. It addresses issues such as the validity and enforceability of automated contracts, party autonomy, and the attribution of actions carried out by automated systems (UNCITRAL, 2024).The UNCITRAL Model Law primarily focuses on automation but could be extended to contract innovation by incorporating legal design thinking. This approach enhances contract usability and readability, aligning with UNCITRAL's ongoing work on digital economy issues. UNCITRAL is actively adapting its frameworks to address emerging needs, including data contracts and distributed ledger technology. This

adaptability suggests potential for future legal innovations in contracting (UNCITRAL, 2024).

Innovation-driven entrepreneurs should use value proposition models, business models, and SWOT analyses to promote contract innovation. This approach aligns lawyers and stakeholders through legal design thinking, creating user-centric contracts that enhance resilience against legal challenges. Contract innovation becomes a business-driven process rather than solely technological (Whittle, 2024).

Legal innovation involves finding new ways to deliver legal services efficiently, using technologies like AI and collaborative mindsets. It encompasses four types: incremental, disruptive, architectural, and radical innovation. The concept of Clio, which represents the intersection of legal innovation and technology, highlights the importance of adapting to evolving legal landscapes (Heidi_Turner, 2024).

Unit 1

Automated Contracts and UNCITRAL Model Law on automated contracting MLAC

This unit explores the UNCITRAL MLAC's focus and the technologies driving contract automation, discussing its benefits and limitations. It presents real-world case studies to illustrate how automation transforms business operations. The unit also examines legal frameworks and technological innovations in contract management.

The automation of contract management is driven by technological advancements and efficiency needs. The UNCITRAL MLAC provides a legal framework for using AI and smart contracts internationally. It aims to reduce legal uncertainties and promote innovation in contract management.

Section 1-1: The Impact of UNCITRAL Model Law on Automated Contracting:

The automation of contract management is driven by technological advancements and efficiency needs. The UNCITRAL MLAC provides a legal framework for using AI and smart contracts internationally. It aims to reduce legal uncertainties and promote innovation in contract management (CHUK LAW, 2024).

Article 11 of the UNCITRAL MLEC addresses also the formation and validity of contracts, stating that an offer and acceptance can be expressed through data messages. Consequently, a contract formed using data messages cannot be denied validity or enforceability solely because it was formed electronically. This provision supports the automation of contracts by ensuring that electronic transactions are legally recognized and valid, aligning with principles found in electronic commerce (CHUK LAW, 2024).

The MLAC enables contracts to be executed much quicker through automation, reducing the time from initiation to completion. Automated systems handle various contract stages, such as drafting, review, and signing, making the process more efficient. This automation minimizes human errors, ensuring contracts are accurate and consistent (UNCITRAL, 2024).

The UNCITRAL MLAC provides a comprehensive legal framework for automated contracting. Article 1 defines key terms, including "automated system" as a computer system capable of carrying out actions without human intervention, and "data message" as electronically generated, sent, received, or stored information. Article 2 outlines the law's scope, covering the use of automated systems in contract formation and performance. Article 3 emphasizes the law's international origin and the need for uniform application1. Article 4 establishes technology neutrality, not requiring specific methods for automated contracting1. Article 5

ensures legal recognition of automated contracting, stating that contracts formed or performed by automated systems cannot be denied validity solely due to lack of human review. Article 6 recognizes the validity of contracts in computer code and those incorporating dynamic information. Article 7 addresses the attribution of actions carried out by automated systems, while the optional Article 8 deals with unexpected actions by these systems. Finally, Article 10 emphasizes that parties cannot avoid legal consequences solely by using an automated system (UNCITRAL, 2024).

Party autonomy allows contracting parties to decide whether and how to use automated systems in their contracts, enabling them to tailor agreements to their needs. The UNCITRAL MLAC supports this autonomy by ensuring the validity and enforceability of contracts formed or performed using automated systems. Article 7 of the MLAC allows parties to choose applicable laws, promoting flexibility and innovation in contractual arrangements. This fosters a dynamic legal environment for automated contracting (UNCITRAL, 2024).

Leow's framework on corporate attribution emphasizes the allocation and delegation of powers to establish liability, which can be applied to the UNCITRAL MLAC to understand automated systems' execution of actions like notifications and acceptances. The MLAC recognizes automated systems as capable of executing these actions without human intervention. This application helps clarify legal responsibilities and

liabilities in automated transactions, attributing automated actions to involved parties (Leow_Rachel, 2024).

Hence, the UNCITRAL MLAC provides a legal framework for contracts formed or performed using automated systems, including those involving artificial intelligence and smart contracts. It ensures that such contracts are not denied validity or enforceability solely because they lack human intervention. The law applies to the formation and performance of contracts through automated systems, maintaining technology neutrality and attributing actions to parties as agreed upon or to the system's user if not specified. It complements existing electronic commerce laws and addresses risks associated with automated systems by providing guidelines for attribution and legal responsibility (UNCITRAL, 2024).

This contract automation involves using technology to simplify and oversee the entire contract process, including creation, review, approval, and management. It employs software tools to automate different phases of the contract lifecycle, from drafting and negotiation to signing and post-signature administration (Deal Hub, 2012).

Smart contracts in the MLAC leverage blockchain technology to automate transactions, enhance transparency, and increase efficiency. However, their immutability poses challenges due to potential irreversible errors. Addressing legal ambiguities and ensuring contractual fairness is crucial for effective integration. (Ballaj, 2024).

Another notable aspect of the MLAC's approach is its explicit recognition of two fundamental characteristics of automated contracting. First, it acknowledges the absence of direct human review and intervention in the contracting process. Second, it recognizes the inherent possibility that computer programs may generate unexpected outputs during contract formation or performance. This recognition demonstrates the law's forward-thinking approach in addressing the unique challenges posed by automated contracting systems (CHUK LAW, 2024)

This MLAC's forward-thinking framework ensures legal principles remain applicable across technologies, maintaining a balanced environment that supports innovation. By focusing on functional aspects and avoiding technology-specific biases, the framework allows for evolution alongside technological advancements, providing clarity and consistency essential for businesses leveraging AI and encouraging the development of new technologies. (Craig, 2015).

The UNCITRAL Model Law on Automated Contracting (MLAC) strengthens smart legal contracts by recognizing their dual human-machine nature. Article 6 validates contracts with computer code and dynamic data, while Article 7 establishes an attribution framework for automated actions. This sequenced approach—where attribution precedes liability—ensures accountability aligns with contract law principles. System outputs remain attributable to legal persons, maintaining

traditional liability frameworks. This supports diverse implementations of machine-readable contracts..

From a researcher's perspective, the UNCITRAL MLA) is seen as offering significant improvements over the Model Law on Electronic Commerce (MLEC). MLAC provides a comprehensive framework for automated contracting by clarifying definitions, applying to both contract formation and performance, and promoting uniformity and good faith. It ensures technology neutrality and legal recognition of automated contracts, enhancing adaptability with dynamic information. Additionally, MLAC introduces clear attribution procedures for automated actions, ensuring legal clarity and flexibility. This framework complements existing laws without overriding them, making MLAC more efficient for automated contracting from a research standpoint**.**

Section 1-2: Contract Automation Trends:

Under Article 2 of the UNCITRAL MLAC as part of Specifically, the Scope of Application section, clarifies that the Model Law does not interfere with existing laws related to the management of automated systems. This provision ensures that existing laws governing the design, commissioning, operation, or use of automated systems remain unaffected. It allows these systems to be regulated by specific rules without interference from the Model Law. The Model Law focuses on contract validity and enforceability, not on how automated systems are

managed. This separation maintains clarity and consistency in legal frameworks (UNCITRAL, 2024).

The legal industry is witnessing a major overhaul, driven by the adoption of cutting-edge contract automation technologies. These technologies are optimizing the processes of contract creation, management, and analysis. The growing prominence of smart contracts and Contract Lifecycle Management (CLM) solutions is expected to have a profound impact by 2025 (DocuSign, 2024).

In 2025, technology will dominate key legal trends, marked by increased adoption of AI and investment in legal technology. CLM solutions is vital for streamlining organizational contract processes. CLM tools automate tasks such as contract creation, review, execution, and storage, leading to reduced legal costs and enhanced visibility. While initial investments are required, CLM solutions enable companies to expedite deal closures and optimize their workflows. Proper contract management is essential for mitigating risks, ensuring compliance, and maximizing financial gains. Furthermore, automated contract templates facilitate faster drafting by providing reusable templates tailored to various business applications. (Das, 2024).

The integration of the UNCITRAL MLAC with AI and electronic signatures transforms the contract management process. AI automates contract drafting, ensuring consistency and accuracy, and quickly reviews and analyzes contracts to identify potential issues. It also dynamically

updates contract terms based on external data, managing risks and detecting anomalies in real-time (UNCITRAL, 2024).

Electronic signatures have revolutionized contract management by offering a rapid, secure, and remote signing process. They provide cost savings, potentially up to 78.62%, and accelerate contract execution by up to 96%. Electronic signatures enhance legal compliance and facilitate further processing by easily incorporating negotiation states. They improve collaboration and user experience by allowing remote signing from any device. Advanced security features ensure the integrity and authenticity of signed contracts (top.legal, 2022).

Modern contract automation systems integrate AI with electronic signatures, offering a holistic digital contracting solution. AI analyzes metadata and manages the signature workflow securely, ensuring compliance and completeness. This integration streamlines the contract lifecycle, reduces errors, and improves decision-making with real-time insights. The synergy also enhances operational efficiency. Additionally, integrating AI with blockchain technology provides enhanced security, transparency, and traceability (legittai, 2024).

The UNCITRAL MLAC supports the growing use of automated systems in contract formation and performance. It ensures that automated contracts are legally valid and enforceable, addressing a need for clarity in digital contracting. MLAC complements AI-driven contract management by recognizing the legal effect of automated actions. Its emphasis on

technological neutrality facilitates the integration of various digital tools, enabling the digitization of the contractual chain. This enhances workflow efficiency and compliance (Miller, 2024). This alignment with contract automation trends positions MLAC as a foundational element in fostering trust and efficiency in automated contracting processes, ultimately supporting the broader adoption of digital contract management solutions that are becoming essential for businesses navigating complex legal landscapes (Button, 2024). However, further research is necessary to fully explore how MLAC interacts with evolving legal technologies and to inform future legislative developments that address the challenges and opportunities presented by AI and automation in contract management.

Section 1-3: Benefits and Challenges of contract automation:

Contract automation enhances efficiency, accuracy, and visibility in contract management. However, it has limitations such as code rigidity and vulnerability to coding errors, which can complicate liability determinations. The legal framework supports automated mechanisms while maintaining core contract principles. Jurisdictional issues remain a concern for cross-border contracts. The UK Law Commission confirms that smart contracts can operate within existing legal frameworks (Bassan, 2024).

In addition, automated contracting can handle a high volume of contracts efficiently and operate 24/7, leading to significant cost savings by reducing labor costs and allowing resources to be allocated to more

strategic tasks (CUHK LAW, 2024). The MLAC provides a clear legal framework that ensures the validity and enforceability of automated contracts, reducing legal uncertainties. It complements and supplements existing laws on electronic transactions, ensuring compliance with relevant legal requirements (CHUK LAW, 2024).

The article "Machines that Make and Keep Promises" highlights how automation can enhance market cooperation through predictable rules. Inflexibility in automated systems can foster reliability when embedded in adaptive regulatory structures. EU financial market reforms demonstrate how systemic risks from automation are mitigated through circuit breakers and transparency mandates. This suggests that Model Laws like UNCITRAL's MLAC must balance automation efficiency with safeguards. Iterative legal updates are necessary to preserve flexibility and enforceability in contract automation (Schmidt-Kessen, 2022).

Contract automation struggles to reconcile traditional legal doctrines with algorithmic decision-making, as seen in the Quoine v B2C2 case. This case highlighted challenges in attributing knowledge to automated systems, with courts focusing on programmers' intent over real-time conditions. The UNCITRAL MLAC validates machine-to-machine transactions but doesn't fully resolve tensions between automated execution and equitable remedies. The MLAC's approach risks perpetuating backward-looking intent analysis, potentially leaving gaps in addressing asymmetric bargaining power exacerbated by automation. This

interplay underscores technical and jurisprudential boundaries in contract automation (Eliza_Mik, 2020).

This Quoine v B2C2 case illustrates the challenges of reconciling traditional legal principles with algorithmic decision-making in contract automation. Courts often focus on programmers' intent rather than real-time conditions, leading to difficulties in attributing knowledge to automated systems. While the UNCITRAL MLAC validates machine-to-machine transactions, it may not fully address the tension between automated execution and equitable remedies, potentially exacerbating asymmetric bargaining power issues. This highlights the ongoing technical and legal challenges in contract automation (Singapore_Courts, 2020).

Section 1-4: Case Studies: Implementation of Contract Automation:

Recent case studies illustrate the profound impact of contract automation on organizational performance. For instance, Oaktree Capital Management utilized AI-powered contract tools to automate the extraction of data from contracts for more than 300 suppliers, which significantly improved operational efficiency and ensured better compliance. (SIRION, 2024) .

This implementation consisted of a centralized contract repository, automated metadata extraction, and a visual data dashboard for tracking obligations and maintaining regulatory compliance.This automation led to quicker benefits realization, improved regulatory compliance, and the establishment of standardized global contracting procedures(SIRION, 2024). Manual contract management poses significant risks, including errors and missed deadlines, which can be mitigated by software automation (Dealsign, 2024).

A multinational software corporation implemented contract management software to streamline its growing number of contracts, achieving improved efficiency and compliance (Contracts365, 2024). Similarly, Freuds, a communications firm, automated its contract management using a customized SharePoint workflow developed by Beyond Intranet (Beyond_Intranet, 2024). This system integrated digital signatures via DocuSign, enhancing visibility and compliance while reducing. The automation streamlined contract creation, approval, and tracking processes. It provided real-time insights into contracting risks and opportunities, saving time and resources (Contracts365, 2024).This approach aligns with broader trends in contract management automation, which improve efficiency and reduce errors (Krysta_Johnson, 2025).

Amgen achieved a significant transformation in its enterprise contracting by incorporating AI-driven Contract Lifecycle Management (CLM) solutions. This integration fostered a more collaborative contract drafting

environment, shortened cycle times, and enhanced the overall contracting process. By utilizing AI CLM, Amgen streamlined its contract management, leading to faster and more efficient operations. This strategic move not only boosted operational efficiency but also positioned Amgen for future growth by embracing innovative contract management technologies. (SIRION, 2024).

Unit 2

Legal Design Thinking in Contract Innovation

In the evolving landscape of contract management, legal design thinking emerges as a transformative force, enhancing contract usability and effectiveness through a structured approach. This methodology involves five key steps: Empathize, Define, Ideate, Prototype, and Test, which are crucial for creating user-friendly and accessible contracts. By integrating legal design thinking with contract innovation, contracts become more readable and understandable, fostering better relationships and dispute resolution. This approach also synergizes law, design, and technology, as illustrated in case studies involving Non-Disclosure Agreements (NDAs). Furthermore, aligning contract innovation with business functions like value proposition models and SWOT analysis can bolster dispute resolution by identifying potential risks and opportunities.

Section 2-1: Five Steps of Legal Design Thinking: Empathize, Define, Ideate, Prototype, and Test:

The legal business model is facing a pressing need for transformation due to two primary reasons. Firstly, clients' needs are evolving towards more pluralistic processes that offer tailored, added-value solutions. Secondly, the traditional legal business model, which is heavily reliant on legal risk analysis, has been shown to have significant flaws and limitations (Fraser, 2016).

Design thinking is a problem-solving methodology that focuses on human needs. It involves five stages: Empathize, Define, Ideate, Prototype, and Test. The process is non-linear and iterative, allowing stages to occur in parallel or be repeated. Empathize involves understanding users' needs through research. Define organizes findings into a problem statement. Ideate generates solutions, while Prototype and Test refine them. This approach fosters innovative solutions by engaging users throughout the process (Dam, 2024).

LDT applies design principles to the legal sector, addressing inefficiencies and technological resistance. It involves a user-centered, five-stage process: empathize, define, ideate, prototype, and test/refine. This approach fosters systematic problem-solving and innovation. It emphasizes collaboration and user feedback to create effective solutions. The process is adaptable and focused on user needs (Lexology , 2021).

LDT was developed at Stanford University's Legal Design Lab in 2013, bringing together lawyers, designers, and technologists to create user-centric legal products and services. It aims to achieve incremental and breakthrough improvements, enhance legal systems, and empower users to manage legal complexities more effectively. This approach challenges traditional legal systems by encouraging out-of-the-box thinking and embracing failure as part of the learning process. It is crucial for legal professionals to adapt to technological changes and improve their work processes. (Lexology , 2021).

Section 2-2: Application of legal design thinking in contract innovation:

In-house corporate counsel plays a crucial role in resolving problems and preventing future issues by creating agreements. However, the legal industry has traditionally been characterized by antiquated processes and a resistance to technological change. This has led to a need for innovation within the legal sector, particularly in how problems are approached and solved (Misra, 2021).

Innovation in the legal context involves devising novel ideas and new ways of thinking to solve specific problems. Harvard Law School has highlighted that innovation is distinct from invention, as it focuses on addressing particular challenges rather than simply creating something new. Legal design thinking has emerged as a powerful tool for achieving

this innovation. It involves defining problems clearly, brainstorming solutions without restrictions, and rapidly prototyping and testing ideas. This approach encourages thinking outside the box and challenges traditional legal systems, fostering a collaborative environment where diverse stakeholders can contribute to the development of user-centric legal solutions (Harvard Law School, 2019).

LDT is deeply rooted in the broader framework of design thinking, which has evolved significantly since its origins. It employs a systematic and flexible methodology for problem-solving, comprising five key stages: empathize, define, ideate, prototype, and test. Each stage plays a vital role in comprehensively understanding and addressing problems. The Stanford Legal Design Lab has been pivotal in applying these principles to legal challenges, leveraging a multidisciplinary approach to create user-centric legal products and services. This approach seeks to empower users and enhance legal systems by making them more accessible and user-friendly, aligning with the lab's mission to ensure equal access to justice for all (Stanford Law School, 2023)

The application of design thinking in law involves several stages. First, lawyers engage with clients to deeply understand their problems and needs through empathy. Next, the problem is clearly defined based on the insights gathered. Then, lawyers generate a wide range of potential solutions during the ideation phase. Solutions are developed into tangible prototypes, which are then tested with clients to refine them. This iterative

process ensures that legal services are tailored to meet the specific needs of clients (Fraser, 2016).

LDT aims to achieve both immediate improvements and long-term transformations in legal management systems. It enhances the effectiveness of legal professionals by equipping them with better tools to navigate complex legal issues. This approach has led to the development of innovative legal management systems that simplify tasks like contracting and compliance (The Impact Lawyer, 2024).

LDT will remain vital for corporate counsel adapting to technological advancements like AI. It integrates human needs with technological feasibility, enabling flexible solutions. The approach will evolve with more technology integration, leading to user-centered services. This will help law firms offer personalized and innovative legal solutions (Fraser, 2016).

Section 2-3: Interdisciplinary Synergy: Combining Law, Design, and Technology:

Baker McKenzie's Whitespace Legal Collab is an innovation lab that combines diverse expertise to solve complex legal challenges. It fosters collaboration among lawyers, clients, designers, and technologists to create user-friendly solutions. The initiative is key to Baker McKenzie's

innovation agenda, driving culture change and talent development (d.marsden, 2017).

Legal Design Thinking combines law, design, and technology to create user-centric solutions. It involves collaboration among lawyers, designers, and technologists to enhance legal services, improving client satisfaction and efficiency. The process includes empathy, ideation, prototyping, and iteration. Examples include Seyfarth Shaw's fixed-fee model and Baker McKenzie's Whitespace Legal Collab (Cimphony, 2022).

A design-driven approach in law emphasizes human-centered design over technology for innovation. It focuses on usability and user experience, making legal processes more accessible. Design thinking can enhance legal services by prioritizing client needs and creating more effective solutions. Combining law and design fosters an experimental culture, user-centered innovation, and new professional paths. This approach can lead to better legal documents and services tailored to users' needs. It encourages lawyers to think creatively and deliver more intentional outcomes. By integrating design, law, and technology can become more user-friendly and service-driven (Hagan, 2016).

In the realm of legal design, design mechanics serve as a powerful tool by leveraging the collective wisdom and experiences of those who have navigated similar challenges. These mechanics encompass a range of essential elements, including principles for effective legal design, user requirements, legal user typology, and next-generation design typologies.

At the heart of this approach are six fundamental principles that guide the creation of user-centric legal services and products (Hagan, 2016).

Moreover, the emphasis on user empowerment stands at the forefront of this approach, aiming to bolster individuals' comprehension and participation in legal proceedings by providing them with essential resources and insights to adeptly maneuver through intricate legal frameworks. By delineating legal endeavors as a lucid, sequential process, clients are enabled to grasp the path forward, akin to following a roadmap through uncharted territory. This methodology cultivates a more encompassing and lucid connection between clients and their legal representatives, promoting candid dialogue and shared comprehension (Hagan, 2016).

The integration of law, design, and technology simplifies legal information, presenting it in a clear and accessible format. This approach caters to diverse user preferences by offering content in multiple formats, such as visual, textual, and digital. It enhances the user experience and promotes better legal outcomes by making legal services more accessible and user-friendly (Hagan, 2016). This integration of law, design, and technology transforms legal services by combining business acumen, design principles, and legal expertise with technology. This approach uses methods like human-centered design to improve legal outcomes and foster collaboration. It solves complex legal problems through strategic design strategies (Integrating Business, Design and Legal , 2021).

Section 2-4: Case Studies: Applying Legal Design Thinking to Non-Disclosure Agreements (NDAs):

Non-disclosure agreements (NDAs) are legally binding contracts that protect sensitive business information by creating a confidential relationship. They safeguard intellectual property and confidential know-how, allowing safe collaboration with third parties. NDAs provide legal recourse in case of breaches, which can be costly if not managed properly. They must be carefully drafted to ensure enforceability (Interaction Design Foundation, 2024).

LDT can enhance the effectiveness of NDAs by making them more user-friendly and accessible. This approach involves understanding the legal system's complexities and applying design principles to improve legal processes, such as contracting and negotiation. By applying legal design thinking, NDAs can be crafted to better align with business needs, ensuring that they facilitate collaboration while protecting sensitive information. This method encourages iterative improvement in NDA drafting, ensuring they remain relevant and effective over time (Fraser, 2016).

LDT integrates design principles into NDA drafting, improving legal processes like contracting and negotiation. This approach aligns NDAs with business needs, facilitating collaboration while protecting sensitive information. It encourages iterative improvement, ensuring NDAs remain

effective over time. This method makes legal business models more user-centered. (Fraser, 2016).

A case study on applying legal design thinking to NDAs might involve several key steps. First, lawyers would engage with stakeholders to understand their needs and concerns regarding confidentiality and collaboration. Next, they would define the specific goals and challenges of the NDA, such as ensuring enforceability while facilitating open communication. Then, they would ideate solutions, potentially including clearer language, more flexible terms, or innovative dispute resolution mechanisms. Prototyping would involve drafting sample NDAs that incorporate these solutions, which would then be tested with stakeholders to refine them (Fraser, 2016).

The application of LDT to NDAs can significantly enhance their usability and effectiveness. However, it is crucial to ensure that any innovations in NDA design comply with existing legal standards and regulations, such as those related to confidentiality and intellectual property protection.

Unit 3

Impact of Contract Innovation on contract effectiveness and efficiencies

Integrating innovative design principles into contract drafting enhances clarity, usability, and customer relationships. This approach focuses on user-centered design, reducing misunderstandings and improving enforceability. Contracts become more accessible, strengthening partnerships and improving legal outcomes. This aligns with legal design lawyering principles, aiming for more efficient and user-friendly legal processes.

Section 3-1: Impact on Design:

LDT profoundly impacts legal processes by introducing a user-centered approach, making them more intuitive and understandable. This involves applying methods like empathy mapping and prototyping to create accessible legal documents and services. Rewriting contracts in plain language enhances user experience, while visual contracts simplify complex terms using graphics. This approach promotes clearer communication and reduces misunderstandings (Zefort, 2024). LDT enhances the accessibility of legal information by simplifying complex concepts and using visual aids like infographics. This approach improves the user experience for all stakeholders and reduces ambiguities that can lead to disputes. It promotes compliance with legal obligations through clearer documentation (Zefort, 2024).

LDT fosters innovation within the legal industry by encouraging creative problem-solving and collaborative approaches. lawyers can identify pain points in legal processes and develop new solutions that better serve client needs. This approach also promotes collaboration between legal professionals and designers, leading to holistic solutions that address both legal and user experience challenges. The integration of design principles into legal work opens up new avenues for innovation, allowing law firms to deliver more efficient and user-friendly legal services (Zefort, 2024).

Section 3-2: Impact on Usability:

LDT significantly impacts the usability of legal documents and processes by making them more accessible and user-friendly. This approach emphasizes the importance of understanding client needs and designing solutions that are intuitive and easy to navigate. By applying design principles, legal professionals can simplify complex legal concepts, reducing confusion and enhancing overall user experience (Zefort, 2024).

One of the significant impacts of LDT on usability is its ability to enhance the accessibility and readability of legal documents. By using clear and plain language, eliminating jargon, and incorporating visual aids, legal documents become more understandable for individuals without a legal background. This approach aligns with the broader goal of making legal information more accessible and empowering users to navigate legal processes with confidence (VisualContracts, 2023).

The impact of LDT on usability extends to communication between lawyers and clients. Simplifying communication through user-friendly interfaces enhances trust and efficiency by reducing unnecessary interactions. This streamlined approach empowers clients to access information and provide feedback effortlessly (VisualContracts, 2023).

In the future, LDT will continue to play a crucial role in enhancing usability within the legal industry. As technology evolves and legal challenges become more complex, the need for user-centric legal solutions will grow. LDT can help navigate these complexities by providing accessible, understandable, and efficient legal processes. This

approach will not only improve client satisfaction but also contribute to a more sustainable and equitable legal system, where access to justice is enhanced for all (Dabaghi, 2022).

Human-Centered Design focuses on creating meaningful experiences by understanding user needs, leading to higher customer satisfaction. Legal Design applies this approach to the legal field, making legal systems more accessible and user-friendly. Usability, on the other hand, emphasizes practical functionality and efficiency in user interactions. While Human-Centered Design and Legal Design prioritize user experience and accessibility, usability focuses on ease of use. Overall, these concepts complement each other in enhancing user interactions (Korum_legal, 2024).

Section 3-3: Impact on customer relationship:

One of the key impacts of LDT on customer relationships is its ability to enhance the client experience. By designing legal solutions that are focused on client needs and expectations, lawyers can create more satisfying and meaningful experiences for their clients. This approach leads to increased trust, empathy, and understanding between lawyers and clients, as lawyers become more attuned to the challenges their clients face (Impact_Lawyers, 2025).

LDT boosts client-centricity by encouraging lawyers to adopt a user-centered approach. This methodology drives innovation in legal practice by promoting creative problem-solving and collaborative solution (Korhonen, What does legal design thinking mean for lawyers?, 2023).

Finally, LDT enhances communication and engagement between lawyers and clients by simplifying complex legal concepts. This approach empowers clients with a clearer understanding of their rights and obligations, allowing them to engage more actively in legal processes. As a result, LDT fosters stronger client relationships built on trust and transparency. This leads to more informed and satisfied clients throughout the legal journey (Korhonen, What is Legal Design and Why You Should Care?, 2023).

Section 3-4: Impact on Language:

LDT revolutionizes legal communication by prioritizing clarity and accessibility. It transforms complex legal documents into user-friendly materials using plain language and visual elements like diagrams and infographics. This approach empowers users by presenting information in an empathetic and understandable way, enhancing collaboration between legal professionals and clients. As a result, legal documents become more digestible and engaging, reducing confusion and misunderstandings (Arifoglu, 2023).

Unit 4

Compare and Contrast contract automation and contract innovation

Contract automation and contract innovation are interconnected concepts that enhance contract management efficiency. Automation uses software to streamline contract processes like creation and review, reducing manual tasks and errors. Innovation adopts new technologies to optimize processes, leading to cost savings and improved productivity. Both approaches allow legal teams to focus on strategic tasks (BIGLE, 2025).

A key difference between contract automation and contract innovation lies in their scope and focus. Contract automation primarily focuses on automating existing processes using software tools, ensuring consistency and accuracy in contract creation and management (Agarwal, 2023). In contrast, contract innovation involves a broader transformation of the contract management process, often incorporating new technologies like AI and blockchain to create more dynamic and responsive contracts (WeAgreee, 2023).

Both contract automation and contract innovation enhance accuracy and compliance in contract management. Automation ensures that contracts are created using pre-approved templates and clauses, reducing the risk of inconsistent terms or ambiguous language (docupilot, 2024). Similarly, contract innovation promotes compliance by integrating new technologies

that can analyze contracts against regulatory requirements and internal policies (WeAgreee, 2023).

Contract automation is particularly effective in streamlining the contract lifecycle by automating tasks such as document creation, data entry, and version control. This approach ensures that contracts are generated quickly, reducing the time spent on manual drafting and revisions. Additionally, automation tools can extract data from various sources and populate contract fields automatically, minimizing errors and enhancing compliance (docupilot, 2024).

Contract innovation, on the other hand, transforms contract management by introducing new methodologies and technologies that can revolutionize how contracts are created, negotiated, and executed. This approach often involves integrating AI-powered tools to analyze contracts, identify potential risks, and suggest improvements. Businesses can create more flexible and responsive contracts that adapt to changing circumstances through leveraging these innovations (WeAgreee, 2023).

Implementing contract automation typically involves fewer challenges compared to contract innovation. Automation often requires integrating existing software tools into current workflows, which can be relatively straightforward (Docjuris, 2024). In contrast, contract innovation may require more significant organizational changes, including adopting new technologies and training staff, which can be more complex and time-consuming (WeAgreee, 2023).

Contract automation offers significant cost reductions by eliminating manual processes and reducing the need for physical document storage (Docjuris, 2024). This approach also enhances efficiency by allowing legal teams to generate contracts quickly and focus on higher-value tasks. For instance, automated contract creation can save up to 75% of the time typically spent on manual drafting (WeAgreee, 2023).

Strategic relationships often falter due to conflicting agendas and behaviors, with legal contracts hindering progress by prioritizing risk avoidance over collaboration. Ideally, contracts should facilitate business outcomes rather than just resolve disputes. Collaboration can better support strategic partnerships (Allan_Watton, 2018).

Unit 5

Role of the Chief Legal Innovation Officer (CLIO) in Developing a strategic contract management roadmap

Contract automation and innovation are interconnected concepts that enhance contract management efficiency and user experience. Automation uses technology to streamline contract processes, while innovation adopts new methodologies to transform these processes. The Chief Legal Innovation Officer plays a key role in integrating both approaches into a strategic roadmap. Legal innovation involves applying new concepts and technologies to improve legal services delivery (Turner, 2024).

Large corporate law firms, often referred to as "Big Law," are undergoing significant changes by hiring tech-oriented talent to fill new C-Suite roles such as Chief Innovation Officers, Chief Information Officers, and Chief Data Officers. This hiring spree is partly driven by the need to adapt to technological advancements, particularly Generative AI, which is transforming the legal landscape. However, the success of these new hires depends on whether their mandate is to transform the existing firm model or merely improve its efficiency. (Cohen, 2024).

Transformation requires a long-term strategy focused on leveraging technology to create new structures and processes that benefit customers, which is a significant departure from Big Law's traditional model (Teal, 2023). The legal tech industry has seen significant growth, with

investments exceeding $3.4 billion in 2022. This surge is driven by the need for more efficient legal processes, particularly in areas like contract automation. As legal departments face increasing volumes of contracts, manual handling becomes impractical and prone to errors. Therefore, adopting a tech-led approach is crucial for maintaining efficiency and reducing the risk of burnout among legal professionals (Teal, 2023).

Contract automation is a key component of modern legal operations, offering a streamlined approach to managing contracts. It involves using technology to automate tasks such as drafting, reviewing, and approving contracts. This not only speeds up the contract lifecycle but also enhances accuracy by minimizing human errors. Moreover, contract automation allows legal teams to focus on higher-value tasks, aligning legal strategies more closely with business objectives (Teal, 2023).

In the context of legal leadership, skills such as strategic vision, business acumen, and technological proficiency are becoming increasingly important. CLIOs must navigate complex legal landscapes while aligning legal strategies with business goals. This requires not only legal expertise but also the ability to manage risk, lead teams effectively, and communicate complex legal concepts clearly. As technology continues to evolve, CLIOs must also embrace legal tech tools to streamline processes and protect their organizations from digital threats (Teal, 2023).

Unit 6

Aligning Contract Innovation Methodology with Business Functions for Enhanced Dispute Resolution in Startups

Startups can align contract innovation with business functions by integrating legal processes into their overall strategy. This ensures contracts support business objectives, enhance efficiency, and reduce legal conflicts. By leveraging technology and innovative practices, startups can streamline legal operations and foster collaboration between legal and business teams. This approach requires lawyers to adopt a strategic, business-oriented mindset (Mack, 2024).

The T-Shaped Lawyer framework is pivotal for lawyers in startups as it equips them with the skills necessary to navigate complex business environments. By combining legal acumen with business acumen, lawyers can provide strategic advice that aligns with the startup's overall objectives. This involves understanding the startup's business model, identifying potential risks, and contributing to business decision-making processes (Mack, 2024).

For innovation-driven entrepreneurs, contracts are not just legal documents but tools that can facilitate innovation and growth. By incorporating elements of contract innovation, such as flexible payment structures and collaborative development phases, startups can attract innovative partners and accelerate the development of new solutions. This approach aligns with public procurement of innovation strategies, which

aim to support startups in testing and scaling their solutions (Pankhuri, 2024).

Integrating the Value Proposition Canvas, Business Model, and SWOT Analysis enhances contract innovation by aligning contracts with customer needs and business strategies. The Value Proposition Canvas ensures contracts meet customer needs, while the Business Model Canvas aligns them with business strategies. SWOT Analysis identifies risks and opportunities, refining contract design to mitigate risks and capitalize on opportunities. Legal Design Thinking further improves contract usability and user experience, with the Chief Legal Innovation Officer driving this integration to support business growth. This approach creates contracts that are both legally sound and supportive of business objectives.

Conclusion

The UNCITRAL Model Law on Automated Contracting (MLAC) introduces a dual-edged paradigm in digital commerce, offering procedural efficiencies through machine-driven transactions while exposing challenges in equitable dispute resolution. MLAC recognizes algorithmic agency, establishing a foundation for global harmonization of automated contracting. However, it struggles with emergent AI behaviors, highlighting the need for adaptive accountability mechanisms. Legal Design Thinking addresses these challenges by injecting human-centricity into algorithmic systems, transforming contracts into dynamic relationship architectures. This approach fosters collaborative renegotiation and empowers stakeholders through accessible interfaces. The Chief Legal Innovation Officer plays a crucial role in aligning technical robustness with business strategies, embedding ethical AI guardrails to ensure organizational resilience. The future of legal-tech requires a balanced approach, combining automation with equitable innovation to navigate technological disruptions effectively.

Recommendations

Critical Analysis of MLAC's Evolution and Limitations:

It is recommended that the UNCITRAL MLAC be enhanced to address equitable dispute resolution and ensure transparency in AI decision-making. This would mitigate vulnerabilities in contractual fairness, particularly for non-specialist stakeholders.

Legal Design Thinking as a Transformative Counterbalance:

Adopt Legal Design Thinking (LDT) to transform contracts into dynamic relationship architectures, enhancing user experience and reducing disputes. LDT's human-centric approach should be integrated into automated systems to introduce flexibility and responsiveness to changing market conditions.

Strategic Role of the CLIO in Hybrid Frameworks:

CLIOs should integrate ethical AI guardrails into contracts, ensuring fairness and compliance through bias-mitigation algorithms. CLIOs should be certified in interdisciplinary competencies to promote balanced contractual ecosystems.

Enhancing Jurisdictional Frameworks:

Establish jurisdictional sandboxes that integrate Legal Design Thinking with advanced technologies to harmonize legal interpretations and improve dispute resolution processes.

Enhancing Equitable Innovation in Automated Contracting:

Adopt MLAC amendments with self-updating regulatory hooks for compliance and AI mediators for term adjustments during market shocks. Additionally, embed impact-weighted scoring systems in public registries and mandate co-development of contracts with end-users using AR-powered negotiation simulators.

Bibliography

(n.d.). Retrieved from https://ironcladapp.com/journal/contracts/non-disclosure-agreements/

Agarwal, K. (2023, Apr 11). *What is Contract Automation? Expert Tips & Insights*. Retrieved from https://www.spotdraft.com/blog/what-is-contract-automation

Allan_Watton. (2018, May 21). *How to Structure Your Contracts to Drive Innovation*. Retrieved from https://www.bestpracticegroup.com/how-to-structure-your-contracts-to-drive-innovation/

Anusha_G. (2024, Novemeber 28). *Everything You Need to Know About Automated Contract Drafting*. Retrieved from Hyperstart: https://www.hyperstart.com/blog/automated-contract-drafting/

Arifoglu, B. (2023, 11 16). *This is the only resource you need to learn a new language.* Retrieved from https://bilgehanarifoglu.medium.com/this-is-the-only-resource-you-need-to-learn-a-new-language-0d11d24e69a4

Ballaj, N. (2024, July 25). Smart Contracts: Legal Implications in the Age. Retrieved from https://www.scirp.org/pdf/blr2024153_13302068.pdf

Bassan, F. (2024). From smart legal contracts to contracts on blockchain: An empirical investigation. *ELSEVIER*. Retrieved from

https://pdf.sciencedirectassets.com/271884/1-s2.0-S0267364924X00047/1-s2.0-S0267364924001018/main.pdf?X-Amz-Security-Token=IQoJb3JpZ2luX2VjENv%2F%2F%2F%2F%2F%2F%2F%2F%2F%2FwEaCXVzLWVhc3QtMSJHMEUCIBFUgyl4649em8%2FDEtgryk8%2FnDz1pefr9Cc9Mo5cCR1aAiEA3JgOFyT3

Beyond_Intranet. (2024). Retrieved from https://www.beyondintranet.com/sharepoint-contract-management

BIGLE. (2025, Jan 16). *Contract automation with CLM: benefits and challenges for companies*. Retrieved from https://blog.biglelegal.com/en/contract-automation-with-clm-benefits-and-challenges-for-companies

Button, K. (2024, Oct 17). *53 Contract Management Statistics Ahead of 2025*. Retrieved from https://www.contractsafe.com/blog/contract-management-statistics-2025

CHUK LAW. (2024, Oct 3). *CLINDS's 26th LegalTech Seminar – 'The New UNCITRAL Model Law on Automated Contracting – Significance & Evaluation' by Dr. Eliza Mik (Online)*. Retrieved from https://www.law.cuhk.edu.hk/app/clindss-26th-legaltech-seminar-the-new-uncitral-model-law-on-automated-contracting-significance-amp-evaluation-by-dr-eliza-mik-online/

Cimphony. (2022). *Legal Design Thinking: Guide for Law Firms & Departments*. Retrieved from https://www.cimphony.ai/insights/legal-design-thinking-guide-for-law-firms-and-departments

Cohen, M. A. (2024, Nov 1). *forbes*. Retrieved from https://www.forbes.com/sites/markcohen1/2024/11/01/the-enigma-of-big-law-innovation/

Contracts365. (2024). *Powerful contract managment software for business that run Microsoft 365*. Retrieved from https://www.contracts365.com/

Craig, C. J. (2015). Technological Neutrality: (Pre)Serving the Purposes of Copyright Law. In U. o. Press. Open Edition Book. Retrieved from https://books.openedition.org/uop/977?lang=en

d.marsden. (2017, Sep 5). *How Baker McKenzie are Innovating the Legal Sphere*. Retrieved from LawyerMonthly : https://www.lawyer-monthly.com/2017/09/how-baker-mckenzie-are-innovating-the-legal-sphere/

Dabaghi, K. (2022). Beyond design thinking and into speculative futures in legal design. doi:10.21606/drs.2022.307

Dam, R. F. (2024). *The 5 Stages in the Design Thinking Process*. Retrieved from Interaction Design Foundation: https://www.interaction-design.org/literature/article/5-stages-in-the-

design-thinking-process?srsltid=AfmBOopAwEzdIW4CklRTi_syqCX0iF2UxS9jUyE0DkDXtawRdOP3o5WQ

Dealsign. (2024). Retrieved from https://www.dealsign.ai/blog/risks-of-manual-contract-management-and-benefits-of-software-automation

Docjuris. (2024, August 30). *What is Contract Automation? Software, Processes, and Benefits*. Retrieved from https://www.docjuris.com/post/what-is-contract-automation-software-processes-and-benefits

docupilot. (2024, may 18). *How Contract Automation Transforms Workflow Efficiency*. Retrieved from https://www.docupilot.com/blog/contract-automation

Eliza_Mik. (2020). Lost in Transmission: Unilateral Mistakes in Automated Contracts. *SSRN*. Retrieved from https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3591657

Fraser, V. (2016). Legal Design Lawyering : Rebooting Legal Business model with Design Thinking. *PEPPERDINE University*, 2-10. Retrieved from https://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1359&context=drlj

Hagan, M. (2016). Law By design . In M. Hagan, *Law By design* . Stanford University,. Retrieved from https://lawbydesign.co/

Harvard Law School. (2019, Feb). *Marketplace of Ideas What innovation is—and isn't*. Retrieved from https://clp.law.harvard.edu/knowledge-hub/magazine/issues/adaptive-innovation/marketplace-of-ideas/

Heidi_Turner. (2024). *Legal Innovation and AI: Risks and Opportunities*. Retrieved from https://www.clio.com/blog/legal-innovation/

Impact_Lawyers. (2025, January 20). Legal Design Thinking: Innovation in Legal Practice. Retrieved from https://theimpactlawyers.com/articles/legal-design-thinking-innovation-in-legal-practice

Integrating Business, Design and Legal . (2021). In E. Allbon. Retrieved from https://www.e-elgar.com/

Interaction Design Foundation. (2024). *What are Non-Disclosure Agreements (NDAs)?* Retrieved from https://www.interaction-design.org/literature/topics/non-disclosure-agreements-ndas

Ironclad. (2024). Retrieved from Non-Disclosure Agreements (NDAs): Everything You Need to Know: https://ironcladapp.com/journal/contracts/non-disclosure-agreements/

Korhonen, H. (2023). *What does legal design thinking mean for lawyers?* Retrieved from https://lawyersdesignschool.com/what-does-legal-design-thinking-mean-for-lawyers/

Korhonen, H. (2023). *What is Legal Design and Why You Should Care?* Retrieved from Lawyers Design Scholls: https://lawyersdesignschool.com/what-is-legal-design-and-why-you-should-care/

Korum_legal. (2024, Feb 29). *Understanding Legal Design: A Key Transformation for the Legal Industry.* Retrieved from https://www.korumlegal.com/blog/legal-design-im-convinced-thoughts-from-a-non-lawyer...-working-in-newlaw

Krysta_Johnson. (2025, Feb 3). *Contract Management Trends for 2025: Generative AI, Agents and More*. Retrieved from https://www.docusign.com/blog/contract-management-trends

legittai. (2024, June 26). *AI in Contract Management: Trends and Predictions*. Retrieved from https://legittai.com/blog/ai-in-contract-management-trends-and-predictions

Leow_Rachel. (2024). Corporate Attribution in.

Lexology . (2021 , July 21). *Five Principles of Legal Design Thinking That Can Improve the Corporate Legal Function*. Retrieved from https://www.lexology.com/library/detail.aspx?g=f41588a2-48ba-4052-8b4d-cb206431637a

Mack, O. V. (2024, Nov 26). *Becoming A T-Shaped Lawyer: Why In-House Lawyers Should Embrace This Framework*. Retrieved from Above the Law: https://abovethelaw.com/2024/11/becoming-a-t-

shaped-lawyer-why-in-house-lawyers-should-embrace-this-framework/

Miller, A. (2024). *2024 Contract Management Trends: Smart Contracts, AI Regulation and More*. Retrieved from https://www.docusign.com/blog/contract-management-trends

Misra, S. (2021, August 17). *Improving the Corporate Legal Function with Legal Design Thinking*. Retrieved from ContractPodAi: https://contractpodai.com/news/legal-design-thinking/

Pankhuri. (2024). *How Contract Manufacturing Can Drive Innovation for Start-ups*. Retrieved from https://karkhana.io/how-contract-manufacturing-can-drive-innovation-for-start-ups/

Schmidt-Kessen. (2022). Machines that Make and Keep Promises. *SSRN*. Retrieved from https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4149464

Singapore_Courts. (2020). *Do Algorithms Dream of Mistaken Contracts?Quoine Pte Ltd v B2C2 Ltd [2020] SGCA(I) 2.* Retrieved from https://www.judiciary.gov.sg/docs/default-source/judgments-docs/quoine-pte-ltd-v-b2c2-ltd.pdf?sfvrsn=1e886806_2

SIRION. (2024). *Amgen Success Story: Transforming Enterprise Contracting With AI CLM*. Retrieved from https://www.sirion.ai/library/webinars/amgen-success-story-transforming-enterprise-contracting/

Stanford Law School. (2023). *Legal Design Lab*. Retrieved from https://law.stanford.edu/organizations/pages/legal-design-lab/#slsnav-our-mission

Teal. (2023). *Chief Legal Officer Skills*. Retrieved from https://www.tealhq.com/skills/chief-legal-officer

The Impact Lawyer. (2024, May 23). *Legal Design Thinking: Innovation in Legal Practice*. Retrieved from https://theimpactlawyers.com/articles/legal-design-thinking-innovation-in-legal-practice

top.legal. (2022, July 5). *Why Electronic Signatures Count in Contract Management*. Retrieved from https://www.top.legal/en/knowledge/advantages-of-the-electronic-signature

Turner, H. (2024). Legal Innovation and AI: Risks and Opportunities. *Clio* .

UNCITRAL. (2024). *UNCITRAL Model Law on Automated Contracting*. Retrieved from https://uncitral.un.org/sites/uncitral.un.org/files/mlac_en.pdf

VisualContracts. (2023). *What is legal Design Thinking*. Retrieved from Visual Contracts: https://www.visualcontracts.eu/our-approach/what-is-legal-design-thinking/

WeAgreee. (2023). Retrieved from Adopting innovation: contract automation product lifecycle explained: https://weagree.com/weblog/adopting-innovations-product-lifecycle/

Whittle, S. (2024, Oct). *Innovation in Law Firms.* Globe Law and Business. Retrieved from https://www.globelawandbusiness.com/books/innovation-in-law-firms-implementing-successful-projects

Zefort. (2024). *The Emerging Trend: Exploring the Impact of Legal Design Applications in the Legal Industry*. Retrieved from https://zefort.com/blog/emerging-trend-exploring-impact-of-legal-design-applications-in-legal-industry/