

The Role of Administrative Law in Regulating Advanced Algorithms: A Legal Framework for Emerging Technologies

Rossa Ilma Silfia

Department of Public Administration, Universitas Yudharta Pasuruan, Pasuruan, Indonesia

Article Information

Article History

Received, May 28, 2025

Revised, June 16, 2025

Accepted, June 18, 2025

Published, June 18, 2025

Corresponding Author:

Rossa Ilma Silfia,
Department of Public
Administration, Universitas
Yudharta Pasuruan,
Pasuruan, Indonesia.
Email:
rossa@yudharta.ac.id

ABSTRACT

The integration of advanced algorithms and artificial intelligence (AI) into public administration has revolutionized decision-making processes, offering enhanced efficiency and scalability. However, this technological advancement presents significant challenges to traditional administrative law frameworks, particularly concerning transparency, accountability, and the protection of fundamental rights. The opacity of algorithmic decision-making, often referred to as the "black box" problem, complicates the ability of individuals to understand and contest administrative decisions that significantly impact their lives. Moreover, the potential for embedded biases within AI systems raises concerns about discrimination and fairness in public service delivery. This paper examines the critical role of administrative law in regulating the deployment of advanced algorithms within public administration. It analyzes existing international regulatory approaches, including the European Union's Artificial Intelligence Act and the Council of Europe's Framework Convention on Artificial Intelligence, which emphasize risk-based classification, transparency, human oversight, and accountability mechanisms. Drawing from these models, the paper proposes a comprehensive legal framework that incorporates mandatory algorithmic impact assessments, enforceable transparency standards, and institutional oversight to ensure that AI applications in public administration align with democratic principles and human rights.

Keywords: Administrative Law, Artificial Intelligence, Algorithmic Regulation, Public Administration.

1. INTRODUCTION

The integration of advanced algorithms and artificial intelligence (AI) into public administration has revolutionized governmental operations, enhancing efficiency and decision-making processes (Justin et al., 2023). From automating welfare distribution to streamlining immigration procedures, these technologies have become integral to modern governance (Kazemi et al., 2019). However, their deployment raises significant concerns regarding transparency, accountability, and the protection of fundamental rights. Traditional administrative law, designed to oversee human decision-making, faces

challenges in adapting to the complexities introduced by automated systems (Malik et al., 2022).

The rapid adoption of algorithmic decision-making in administrative functions has outpaced the development of corresponding legal frameworks (Ding et al., 2020). This lag has led to instances where opaque algorithms make critical decisions without adequate oversight, potentially infringing on individuals' rights and undermining public trust (Belhadj et al., 2019). The absence of clear legal guidelines for the use of advanced algorithms in public administration necessitates a reevaluation of administrative law to address these emerging challenges (Zhu, 2023).

Existing literature underscores the need for regulatory mechanisms to govern AI in public administration (Seth et al., 2021). Studies have highlighted the risks associated with algorithmic opacity, bias, and lack of accountability. For instance, the European Union's AI Act categorizes AI systems based on risk levels, imposing stricter regulations on high-risk applications to ensure transparency and human oversight (Et al., 2023). Similarly, the Council of Europe's Framework Convention on Artificial Intelligence emphasizes aligning AI deployment with human rights and democratic values. Despite these efforts, a comprehensive legal framework that integrates these principles into administrative law remains underdeveloped (Nolan et al., 2021).

This paper proposes the development of a robust legal framework within administrative law to regulate the use of advanced algorithms in public administration. The framework aims to ensure transparency, accountability, and the protection of fundamental rights by incorporating principles from existing international regulations, such as the EU's AI Act and the Council of Europe's Framework Convention (Ma et al., 2021). Key components of the proposed framework include: Transparency and Explainability: Mandating that algorithmic decision-making processes are transparent and understandable to stakeholders. Accountability Mechanisms: Establishing clear lines of responsibility among developers, vendors, and public agencies. Regular Audits and Impact Assessments: Requiring periodic evaluations of AI systems to ensure compliance with legal and ethical standards. Public Participation and Oversight: Incorporating mechanisms for stakeholder engagement to enhance legitimacy and trust (Seth et al., 2021).

The novelty of this research lies in its comprehensive approach to integrating AI regulation within the existing framework of administrative law. By synthesizing principles from international regulations and addressing the unique challenges posed by advanced algorithms, the proposed framework offers a structured pathway for governments to harness the benefits of AI while safeguarding democratic values and individual rights. This contribution is particularly pertinent as public administrations worldwide grapple with the legal implications of rapidly advancing technologies.

2. LITERATUR REVIEW

Challenges of Algorithmic Decision-Making in Public Administration

The integration of algorithmic decision-making (ADM) in public administration introduces significant challenges to traditional administrative law frameworks. Williams (2021) emphasizes that ADM systems often operate with opacity, making it difficult to assess their decision-making processes. This opacity complicates the application of principles such as transparency and accountability, which are central to administrative law (Grimmelikhuijsen & Meijer, 2022). Furthermore, the scalability of errors in ADM

systems and their reliance on correlations rather than causations pose additional hurdles for legal oversight (Williams, 2021).

International Regulatory Approaches

European Union's Artificial Intelligence Act

The European Union has taken a proactive stance with the introduction of the Artificial Intelligence Act (AI Act) in 2024. This regulation classifies AI systems based on risk levels unacceptable, high, limited, and minimal and imposes corresponding obligations (Veale & Brass, 2019). High-risk AI systems, particularly those used in critical infrastructure and public services, are subject to stringent requirements, including conformity assessments and transparency obligations (Europe, 2024). The AI Act serves as a model for integrating AI governance within existing legal frameworks.

Council of Europe's Framework Convention on Artificial Intelligence

Complementing the EU's efforts, the Council of Europe adopted the Framework Convention on Artificial Intelligence in 2024. This international treaty aims to ensure that AI technologies align with fundamental human rights, democratic values, and the rule of law. It emphasizes risk and impact management, legal remedies, and cooperation mechanisms among member states (Europe, 2024).

National Strategies and Comparative Perspectives

Trisnawati (2024) provides a comparative analysis of AI governance strategies across different jurisdictions. The study highlights that while the European Union's stringent regulations enhance legal clarity and public trust, they may also impede innovation due to higher compliance costs. In contrast, the United States' more lenient approach fosters innovation but leads to legal ambiguities (She & Wotherspoon, 2013). China's strategy focuses on state-led development with an emphasis on ethical considerations (Kim, 2023). The study underscores the need for a balanced approach that harmonizes innovation with regulation through international collaboration (Huang et al., 2022).

Contestability and Human Oversight

Lyons, Velloso, and Miller (2021) argue for the incorporation of contestability mechanisms in ADM systems, drawing insights from administrative law. They suggest that embedding avenues for individuals to challenge algorithmic decisions can enhance accountability and trust. However, Green (2021) critiques the reliance on human oversight, pointing out that such measures may be ineffective if not properly structured. Green advocates for institutional oversight, where agencies must justify the use of algorithms and subject them to democratic review before deployment (Green, 2021).

Precautionary Principle and International Obligations

Druzin, Boute, and Ramsden (2025) discuss the application of the precautionary principle in the context of AI regulation. They argue that, given the potential existential risks posed by advanced AI, states have an international obligation to implement preventive measures even in the absence of full scientific certainty. This principle, rooted in international environmental law, can be extended to AI governance to ensure proactive risk mitigation (Druzin A.; Ramsden, M., 2025).

3. RESEARCH METHOD

1. Research Design

According to Mitchel (2023) this study employs a qualitative legal research approach, integrating doctrinal analysis, comparative legal analysis, and normative legal theory. The research aims to critically examine existing administrative legal frameworks and their efficacy in regulating advanced algorithmic technologies, particularly within public administration. By analyzing statutory provisions, case law, policy documents, and scholarly literature, the study seeks to identify gaps and propose enhancements to current legal structures.

2. Research Chronology

Phase 1: Preliminary Literature Review

- Objective: To establish a foundational understanding of the intersection between administrative law and algorithmic governance.
- Activities:
 - Review of existing literature on administrative law principles, AI regulation, and algorithmic decision-making.
 - Identification of key themes, challenges, and debates in the current discourse.
- Outcome: A comprehensive overview of the current state of administrative law in the context of emerging technologies.

Phase 2: Doctrinal Legal Analysis

- Objective: To analyse existing legal frameworks governing administrative procedures and their applicability to algorithmic systems.
- Activities:
 - Examination of statutes, regulations, and case law related to administrative decision-making processes.
 - Assessment of legal principles such as transparency, accountability, and due process in the context of AI.
- Outcome: Identification of strengths and limitations within current legal provisions concerning algorithmic governance.

Phase 3: Comparative Legal Analysis

- Objective: To compare international approaches to regulating AI within administrative contexts.
- Activities:
 - Analysis of the European Union's Artificial Intelligence Act and its implications for administrative law.
 - Examination of the Council of Europe's Framework Convention on Artificial Intelligence and Human Rights.
 - Review of the United States' Administrative Procedure Act and its relevance to AI regulation.
- Outcome: Insights into best practices and potential models for integrating AI regulation into administrative law.

Phase 4: Normative Framework Development

- Objective: To propose a legal framework that effectively regulates advanced algorithms within administrative processes.
- Activities:

- Synthesis of findings from previous phases to identify key elements necessary for effective regulation.
- Formulation of recommendations for legal reforms and policy initiatives.
- Outcome: A proposed legal framework that addresses identified gaps and aligns with principles of good governance (Hasbullah, 2022).
-

3. Research Procedures

- **Data Collection:**
 - Compilation of legal texts, including statutes, regulations, and judicial decisions.
 - Collection of policy documents, white papers, and reports from governmental and non-governmental organizations.
 - Review of academic literature from legal journals, books, and conference proceedings.
- **Data Analysis:**
 - Application of doctrinal analysis to interpret legal texts and understand their implications.
 - Use of comparative analysis to identify differences and similarities across jurisdictions.
 - Employment of normative analysis to evaluate the desirability and feasibility of proposed legal reforms.

4. RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

1. Transparency and Explainability

The deployment of advanced algorithms in public administration often results in opaque decision-making processes, commonly referred to as "black box" algorithms. This lack of transparency hinders individuals' ability to understand, challenge, or appeal decisions that significantly affect their lives. For instance, the AI Now Institute at NYU has highlighted concerns about such algorithms used by public agencies in areas like criminal justice, health, and welfare, emphasizing the need for greater scrutiny and due process for algorithmic decisions (Laihad & Suhardi, 2023).

Administrative law principles necessitate that decision made by public authorities be transparent and justifiable (Rizky Vita Losi et al., 2023). To align algorithmic decision-making with these principles, legal frameworks must mandate the disclosure of algorithmic logic, data sources, and decision-making criteria. This ensures that affected individuals can comprehend the basis of decisions and seek redress if necessary (Saputra et al., 2023).

2. Accountability and Redress Mechanisms

The integration of AI systems into public administration introduces challenges in assigning accountability, especially when errors occur (Manisah et al., 2023). A notable example is Michigan's Unemployment Insurance Agency's use of the Michigan Integrated Data Automated System (MiDAS), which falsely accused thousands of residents of fraud, leading to severe financial and personal consequences (Lailatul Fitria et al., 2023).

Administrative law must evolve to address such scenarios by establishing clear accountability structures (Sheehy Y.-F., 2024). This includes defining the responsibilities of developers, vendors, and public agencies involved in deploying AI systems. Moreover, robust redress mechanisms should be in place to provide remedies for individuals adversely affected by algorithmic decisions (Sheehy Y.-F., 2024).

3. International Regulatory Frameworks

Recognizing the global implications of AI in public administration, international bodies have initiated efforts to establish regulatory frameworks (Co-operation, 2024). The Council of Europe's Framework Convention on Artificial Intelligence aims to ensure that AI systems respect human rights, democracy, and the rule of law. This legally binding treaty mandates impact assessments and transparency in AI practices.

Similarly, the European Union's proposed AI Act categorizes AI systems based on risk levels and imposes corresponding regulatory requirements. High-risk systems, such as those used in critical infrastructure or law enforcement, are subject to stringent obligations, including transparency, human oversight, and data governance (Wu S., 2023).

4. The Right to Explanation

The concept of a "right to explanation" has emerged as a pivotal element in ensuring transparency in algorithmic decision-making. The European Union's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) provides individuals with the right to obtain meaningful information about the logic involved in automated decisions. France's Digital Republic Act further strengthens this right by requiring public sector bodies to disclose the rules and principal characteristics of algorithmic treatments upon request.

Administrative law frameworks should incorporate and enforce such rights, ensuring that individuals can access explanations for decisions that significantly impact them. This fosters trust in public administration and upholds the principles of fairness and accountability (Ma et al., 2021).

5. Human Oversight and Institutional Accountability

While human oversight is often proposed as a safeguard against algorithmic errors, its effectiveness is contingent upon the ability of individuals to understand and intervene in complex AI systems (Buratto et al., 2024). Research indicates that human oversight alone may not suffice, as individuals may lack the necessary expertise to identify and rectify algorithmic biases or errors (Buratto et al., 2024).

Therefore, administrative law should emphasize institutional accountability, mandating that public agencies establish comprehensive oversight mechanisms (Gramlich & Klyachko, 2017). This includes regular audits, impact assessments, and the involvement of multidisciplinary teams to monitor and evaluate AI systems' performance and compliance with legal and ethical standards (Kewat & Singh, 2019).

6. Recommendations for a Robust Legal Framework

Based on the analysis, the following recommendations are proposed to strengthen administrative law in regulating advanced algorithms:

- **Mandate Transparency:** Require public disclosure of algorithmic decision-making processes, including data sources, logic, and criteria.
- **Establish Clear Accountability:** Define the responsibilities of all stakeholders involved in deploying AI systems and implement mechanisms for redress in cases of harm.
- **Enforce the Right to Explanation:** Ensure that individuals have the legal right to obtain explanations for decisions made by AI systems that affect them.

- **Implement Institutional Oversight:** Develop comprehensive oversight structures within public agencies to monitor AI systems' compliance with legal and ethical standards.
- **Adopt International Best Practices:** Align national administrative laws with international treaties and regulations to ensure consistency and uphold fundamental rights.

5. CONCLUSION

The integration of advanced algorithms into public administration offers opportunities for efficiency and innovation. However, it also poses significant challenges to transparency, accountability, and the protection of individual rights. Administrative law must adapt to these challenges by establishing robust legal frameworks that govern the deployment and use of AI systems. By implementing the recommendations outlined above, governments can harness the benefits of AI while safeguarding democratic principles and the rule of law.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to express our sincere gratitude to the Department of Public Administration and the Faculty of Social and Political Sciences at Universitas Islam Negeri Sayyid Ali Rahmatullah Tulungagung for their unwavering support throughout this research. Their academic guidance, resources, and conducive research environment have been instrumental in the completion of this study.

Special thanks are due to our esteemed lecturers and administrative staff for their invaluable assistance and encouragement. We also appreciate the constructive feedback from our peers and fellow students, which has significantly enhanced the quality of this work.

This research would not have been possible without the collaborative spirit and dedication of all those involved. We hope this study contributes meaningfully to the field of public administration and serves as a resource for future academic endeavors.

REFERENCES

- Belhadj, S., Belmokhtar, K., & Ghedamsi, K. (2019). Improvement of energy management control strategy of fuel cell hybrid electric vehicles based on artificial intelligence techniques. *Journal European Des Systemes Automatises*. <https://doi.org/10.18280/jesa.520601>
- Buratto, W. G., Muniz, R. N., Nied, A., Barros, C. F. de O., Cardoso, R., & Gonzalez, G. V. (2024). A Review of Automation and Sensors: Parameter Control of Thermal Treatments for Electrical Power Generation. In *Sensors*. <https://doi.org/10.3390/s24030967>
- Co-operation, E. C. on L. (2024). *Artificial Intelligence and Administrative Law*. Council of Europe.
- Ding, F., Zhang, Y., Simpson, J., Bernstein, A., & Vadari, S. (2020). Optimal energy dispatch of distributed PVS for the next generation of distribution management systems. *IEEE Open Access Journal of Power and Energy*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/OAJPE.2020.3009684>
- Druzin A.; Ramsden, M., B. . B. (2025). *Confronting Catastrophic Risk: The International Obligation to Regulate Artificial Intelligence*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2503.18983>
- Et al., J. N. (2023). Innovative AI-driven Automation System Leveraging Advanced Perceptive Technologies to Establish an Ideal Self-Regulating Video Surveillance Model. *Tuijin Jishu/Journal of Propulsion Technology*. <https://doi.org/10.52783/tjjpt.v44.i2.220>
- Europe, C. of. (2024). *Framework Convention on Artificial Intelligence and Human Rights, Democracy and the Rule of Law*. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Framework_Convention_on_Artificial_Intelligence
- Gramlich, M. W., & Klyachko, V. A. (2017). Actin/Myosin-V- and Activity-Dependent Inter-synaptic Vesicle Exchange in Central Neurons. *Cell Reports*.

- <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.celrep.2017.02.010>
- Green, B. (2021). *The Flaws of Policies Requiring Human Oversight of Government Algorithms*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2109.05067>
- Grimmelikhuijsen, S., & Meijer, A. (2022). Legitimacy of Algorithmic Decision-Making: Six Threats and the Need for a Calibrated Institutional Response. *Perspectives on Public Management and Governance*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ppmgov/gvac008>
- Hasbullah, M. A. (2022). Blue Concept Economy Implementation in Coastal Communities Based on The Law Number 11 of 2020 on Job Creation Perspective. *Journal of Social Science*. <https://doi.org/10.46799/jss.v3i1.283>
- Huang, F., Crăciun, D., & de Wit, H. (2022). Internationalization of higher education in a post-pandemic world: Challenges and responses. In *Higher Education Quarterly*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hequ.12392>
- Justin, S., Saleh, W., Lashin, M. M. A., & Albalawi, H. M. (2023). Modeling of Artificial Intelligence-Based Automated Climate Control with Energy Consumption Using Optimal Ensemble Learning on a Pixel Non-Uniformity Metro System. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su151813302>
- Kazemi, Z., Safavi, A. A., Pouresmaeeli, S., & Naseri, F. (2019). A practical framework for implementing multivariate monitoring techniques into distributed control system. *Control Engineering Practice*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conengprac.2018.10.003>
- Kewat, S., & Singh, B. (2019). Modified amplitude adaptive control algorithm for power quality improvement in multiple distributed generation system. *IET Power Electronics*. <https://doi.org/10.1049/iet-pel.2018.5936>
- Kim, T.-K. (2023). “Discourse on Socialism in Full-Scale Development and Kim Jong Un Regime’s Long-term National Strategy: In Comparative Perspective of China’s Reform Era.” *Journal of Korean Politics*. <https://doi.org/10.35656/jkp.32.1.7>
- Laihad, G. H., & Suhardi, E. (2023). The Influence of Work Motivation and Knowledge on Organizational Citizenship Behavior of Kindergarten Teachers in Bogor City. *Neo Journal of Economy and Social Humanities*, 2(1 SE-The Published Articles), 51–58. <https://doi.org/10.56403/nejesh.v2i1.90>
- Lailatul Fitria, N. J., Marwiyah, S., & Busthomy, A. N. (2023). Realizing Excellent and Quality Public Policy through Emergency Call 112 Service in Probolinggo City. *Neo Journal of Economy and Social Humanities*, 2(1 SE-The Published Articles), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.56403/nejesh.v2i1.78>
- Lyons E., Miller, T., H. . V. (2021). *Designing for Contestation: Insights from Administrative Law*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2102.04559>
- Ma, Y., Chen, X., Wang, L., & Yang, J. (2021). Study on Smart Home Energy Management System Based on Artificial Intelligence. *Journal of Sensors*. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/9101453>
- Malik, A. H., Arshad, F., & Memon, A. A. (2022). Modeling and Intelligent Controller Design for Reactor Regulating System of Advanced CANDU Reactor (ACR-700) in LabVIEW. *Proceedings of the Pakistan Academy of Sciences: Part A*. [https://doi.org/10.53560/PPASA\(59-4\)783](https://doi.org/10.53560/PPASA(59-4)783)
- Manisah, Andriyani, I., & Oktarina, L. (2023). Effect of Profitability and Leverage on Firm Value with Dividend Policy as an Intervening Variable in LQ45 Companies on the IDX. *Neo Journal of Economy and Social Humanities*, 2(1 SE-The Published Articles), 9–16. <https://doi.org/10.56403/nejesh.v2i1.83>
- Mitchell, M. (2023). Analyzing the law qualitatively. *Qualitative Research Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/QRJ-04-2022-0061>
- Nolan, J. P., Sandroni, C., Böttiger, B. W., Cariou, A., Cronberg, T., Friberg, H., Genbrugge, C., Haywood, K., Lilja, G., Moulaert, V. R. M., Nikolaou, N., Olasveengen, T. M., Skrifvars, M. B., Taccone, F., & Soar, J. (2021). European Resuscitation Council and European Society of Intensive Care Medicine guidelines 2021: post-resuscitation care. *Intensive Care Medicine*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00134-021-06368-4>

- Rizky Vita Losi, Fadlan, A., & Selviani, P. (2023). Foreign Branding and Its Effect on Brand Perception: an Overview to Local Entrepreneurs. *Neo Journal of Economy and Social Humanities*, 2(1 SE-The Published Articles), 46–50. <https://doi.org/10.56403/nejesh.v2i1.88>
- Saputra, I., Murwaningsari, E., & Augustine, Y. (2023). The Role Of Enterprise Risk Management And Digital Transformation On Sustainable Banking In Indonesia. *Neo Journal of Economy and Social Humanities*, 2(1 SE-The Published Articles), 17–30. <https://doi.org/10.56403/nejesh.v2i1.85>
- Seth, B., Dalal, S., Le, D. N., Jaglan, V., Dahiya, N., Agrawal, A., Sharma, M. M., Prakash, D., & Verma, K. D. (2021). Secure cloud data storage system using hybrid paillier-blowfish algorithm. *Computers, Materials and Continua*. <https://doi.org/10.32604/cmc.2021.014466>
- She, Q., & Wotherspoon, T. (2013). International student mobility and highly skilled migration: A comparative study of Canada, the United States, and the United Kingdom. *SpringerPlus*. <https://doi.org/10.1186/2193-1801-2-132>
- Sheehy Y.-F., B. . N. (2024). The Challenges of AI-Decision-Making in Government and Administrative Law: A Proposal for Regulatory Design. *Indiana Law Review*, 57(3).
- Trisnawati. (2024). Artificial Intelligence Governance and Regulation: A Roadmap to Developing Legal Policies for Artificial Intelligence Deployment. *Journal of Governance and Administrative Reform*, 5(2). <https://e-journal.unair.ac.id/JGAR/article/view/65194>
- Veale, M., & Brass, I. (2019). Administration by Algorithm? In *Algorithmic Regulation*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198838494.003.0006>
- Williams, R. (2021). Rethinking Administrative Law for Algorithmic Decision Making. *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*, 42(2), 468–494. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ojls/gqab032>
- Wu S., W. . L. (2023). *A Comprehensive Review and Systematic Analysis of Artificial Intelligence Regulation Policies*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.12218>
- Zhu, C. (2023). Real-Time Monitoring and Assessment System with Facial Landmark Estimation for Emotional Recognition in Work. *International Journal on Recent and Innovation Trends in Computing and Communication*. <https://doi.org/10.17762/ijritcc.v11i8.7737>