Page 3253 - 3279 **DOI:** *https://doij.org/10.10000/IJLMH.1110199*

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LAW MANAGEMENT & HUMANITIES

[ISSN 2581-5369]

Volume 8 | Issue 3

2025

Algorithmic Rulemaking Delegated Legislation in the Age of AI and the Implications for Transparency, Accountability, and Judicial Review

VU MINH CHAU[1]

ABSTRACT

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) technologies into administrative rulemaking processes presents unprecedented challenges for traditional administrative law doctrines. This research examines how algorithmic systems employed in delegated legislation affect core principles of transparency, accountability, and judicial review. Through doctrinal analysis and comparative examination of emerging regulatory frameworks, this study demonstrates that existing administrative law mechanisms are inadequately equipped to address the unique challenges posed by AI-driven rulemaking. The research reveals that algorithmic rulemaking creates a fundamental tension between efficiency gains and democratic accountability, particularly in areas of procedural transparency and judicial oversight. The findings suggest that adaptive legal frameworks must evolve to maintain the legitimacy of delegated legislation while accommodating technological innovation. This paper proposes enhanced procedural safeguards, modified transparency requirements, and new standards for judicial review specifically tailored to algorithmic governance contexts.

Keywords: *algorithmic governance, delegated legislation, administrative law, artificial intelligence, transparency, accountability, judicial review*

I. INTRODUCTION

Modern administrative states increasingly rely on algorithmic systems to formulate, implement, and enforce regulatory decisions (Coglianese, 2021). This technological transformation extends beyond individual administrative decisions to encompass the fundamental process of rulemaking itself. Algorithmic rulemaking represents a paradigmatic shift where artificial intelligence systems participate in creating, modifying, or implementing delegated legislation. This development challenges established administrative law doctrines that presuppose human decision-makers operating through transparent, rational processes.

[1] Author is a Phd Candidate at University of Law, Vietnam National University, Vietnam.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

Delegated legislation has long served as the primary mechanism through which administrative agencies translate broad statutory mandates into specific regulatory requirements (Keyes, 2015). Traditional oversight mechanisms rely on procedural transparency, reasoned explanation, and judicial review to ensure democratic accountability and rule of law compliance. However, when algorithmic systems become integral to rulemaking processes, these oversight mechanisms encounter fundamental limitations rooted in the opacity and complexity of AI decision-making processes.

The integration of AI into rulemaking processes manifests across multiple dimensions. Agencies increasingly employ machine learning algorithms to analyze vast datasets for policy development, use automated systems to generate regulatory provisions, and implement AI-driven monitoring systems that dynamically adjust rules based on real-time data (Engstrom et al., 2020). These applications promise enhanced accuracy, consistency, and responsiveness in regulatory governance. Simultaneously, they introduce novel challenges for ensuring democratic legitimacy and legal accountability.

This research addresses a critical gap in understanding how traditional administrative law principles apply to algorithmic rulemaking contexts. Existing scholarship has primarily focused on AI applications in individual administrative decisions rather than systemic rulemaking processes (Bignami, 2022). The unique characteristics of delegated legislation—its general applicability, prospective effect, and binding legal character—create distinct challenges when algorithmic systems participate in its creation or implementation.

The central argument of this paper is that algorithmic rulemaking necessitates fundamental adaptations to administrative law doctrines while preserving core democratic values. Current transparency requirements, accountability mechanisms, and judicial review standards prove inadequate when applied to AI-driven rulemaking processes. This inadequacy stems from the inherent opacity of machine learning algorithms, the distributed nature of algorithmic decision-making, and the dynamic character of AI systems that can modify their behavior based on new data inputs.

This research contributes to administrative law scholarship by providing a comprehensive framework for understanding and addressing the challenges posed by algorithmic rulemaking. Through doctrinal analysis and comparative examination of emerging regulatory approaches, this study identifies specific areas where existing law requires modification and proposes concrete solutions for maintaining democratic accountability in an increasingly automated administrative state.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Foundational Principles of Delegated Legislation

Delegated legislation represents a fundamental mechanism of modern governance, enabling administrative agencies to translate broad statutory mandates into specific regulatory requirements. The legitimacy of delegated legislation rests on several foundational principles that have evolved through decades of administrative law development. Parliamentary sovereignty provides the ultimate source of authority, while practical necessity justifies the delegation of law-making powers to specialized administrative bodies (Craig, 2019).

The theoretical foundation of delegated legislation emerges from the recognition that modern governance requires technical expertise and administrative flexibility that traditional legislative processes cannot provide. Legislatures lack the specialized knowledge and procedural agility necessary to address complex regulatory challenges across diverse policy domains (Baldwin et al., 2012). Consequently, delegated legislation serves as an essential bridge between legislative intent and administrative implementation.

Traditional oversight mechanisms for delegated legislation operate through multiple channels designed to ensure democratic accountability and legal compliance. Parliamentary scrutiny provides political oversight through various committee structures and procedural requirements (Fleming et al., 2023). Judicial review offers legal oversight by examining whether delegated legislation falls within authorized statutory boundaries and complies with procedural requirements (Page, 2024). These mechanisms collectively aim to prevent abuse of delegated authority while maintaining administrative efficiency.

The scope and intensity of judicial review of delegated legislation have evolved considerably across different jurisdictions. Courts generally apply heightened scrutiny to delegated legislation compared to primary legislation, recognizing that such instruments lack direct democratic mandate (Craig & De Búrca, 2020). The grounds for judicial review typically encompass procedural irregularities, substantive unreasonableness, and ultra vires challenges where delegated legislation exceeds statutory authorization.

Recent scholarship has identified increasing challenges to traditional oversight mechanisms as delegated legislation becomes more prevalent and complex. The sheer volume of regulatory instruments, their technical complexity, and their interconnectedness create practical barriers to effective oversight (Sunstein, 2021). These challenges become particularly acute when algorithmic systems participate in rulemaking processes, introducing additional layers of complexity that existing oversight mechanisms struggle to address.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

B. Artificial Intelligence in Administrative Governance

The application of artificial intelligence technologies in public administration has expanded rapidly across multiple domains, from individual benefit determinations to complex regulatory analysis (Coglianese, 2021). This expansion reflects both technological capabilities and administrative pressures to improve efficiency, accuracy, and consistency in regulatory governance. However, the integration of AI into administrative processes raises fundamental questions about democratic accountability, procedural fairness, and legal oversight.

Current applications of AI in administrative governance encompass several distinct categories, each presenting unique challenges for administrative law. Predictive analytics enable agencies to identify patterns in regulatory compliance and target enforcement resources more effectively (Engstrom et al., 2020). Automated decision systems process individual applications and determinations according to predefined algorithmic rules. Natural language processing facilitates analysis of public comments and regulatory documents at unprecedented scale.

The benefits of AI applications in administrative contexts include enhanced accuracy in data analysis, improved consistency in decision-making, and increased responsiveness to changing conditions (Coglianese, 2021). Algorithmic systems can process vast amounts of information more quickly and systematically than human decision-makers, potentially reducing errors and bias in administrative processes. Additionally, AI systems can operate continuously without fatigue or emotional influence, maintaining consistent performance standards.

However, these benefits come with significant challenges that affect fundamental administrative law principles. The "black box" problem refers to the difficulty of understanding how complex AI systems reach particular decisions (Pasquale, 2015). This opacity conflicts with requirements for reasoned explanation and transparency that underpin administrative accountability. Machine learning algorithms may exhibit biases present in training data or develop unexpected behaviors that are difficult to detect and correct.

The accountability challenges associated with AI in administrative governance extend beyond technical limitations to encompass broader questions about democratic oversight and legal responsibility. When algorithmic systems participate in administrative decisions, it becomes difficult to identify specific human actors responsible for particular outcomes (Bignami, 2022). This diffusion of responsibility complicates traditional approaches to administrative accountability that rely on identifying and sanctioning responsible officials.

C. Transparency and Explainability in Algorithmic Governance

Transparency represents a fundamental principle of democratic governance, enabling public

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

scrutiny of administrative decisions and ensuring accountability to affected citizens. In the context of algorithmic governance, transparency requirements encounter significant challenges arising from the technical complexity and proprietary nature of AI systems (Diakopoulos, 2016). Traditional transparency mechanisms, such as publication requirements and access to information laws, prove inadequate when applied to algorithmic decision-making processes.

The concept of explainable AI (XAI) has emerged as a potential solution to transparency challenges in algorithmic governance. XAI refers to AI systems designed to provide understandable explanations of their decision-making processes to human users (Ribeiro et al., 2016). However, the development of truly explainable AI systems remains technically challenging, particularly for complex machine learning models that rely on sophisticated pattern recognition techniques.

Different stakeholders require different types of explanations from AI systems, creating challenges for designing appropriate transparency mechanisms. Technical experts may require detailed information about model architecture, training data, and performance metrics. Affected individuals may need simple explanations of how algorithmic decisions affect their specific circumstances. Oversight bodies may require comprehensive information about system behavior across different contexts and populations (Wachter et al., 2017).

The trade-offs between transparency and other values complicate the design of appropriate disclosure requirements for algorithmic governance. Greater transparency may compromise system security by revealing vulnerabilities that malicious actors could exploit. Detailed disclosure of algorithmic operations may enable gaming behaviors that undermine regulatory effectiveness. Additionally, transparency requirements may conflict with intellectual property protections for proprietary AI systems developed by private contractors.

Recent regulatory developments have attempted to address transparency challenges through various mechanisms, including algorithmic impact assessments, mandatory disclosure requirements, and audit procedures (European Commission, 2021). However, these approaches have not yet been systematically applied to the specific context of algorithmic rulemaking, where transparency requirements must accommodate both the general public interest in understanding regulatory decisions and the technical complexity of AI systems.

D. Accountability Mechanisms in Algorithmic Administrative Law

Administrative accountability encompasses multiple dimensions, including political accountability to elected officials, legal accountability through judicial review, and administrative accountability through internal oversight mechanisms. The integration of AI

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

systems into administrative processes challenges traditional accountability mechanisms by introducing new sources of discretion and complexity that existing oversight structures struggle to address effectively.

Political accountability relies on the ability of elected officials to oversee and direct administrative agencies through various mechanisms, including appointment powers, budget controls, and legislative oversight (McCubbins et al., 1987). When agencies employ algorithmic systems, the technical complexity of AI decision-making may exceed the expertise of political overseers, creating barriers to effective accountability. Additionally, the speed and scale of algorithmic operations may outpace traditional oversight mechanisms designed for human-paced administrative processes.

Legal accountability through judicial review faces particular challenges in algorithmic governance contexts. Courts traditionally rely on administrative records that document the reasoning and evidence underlying administrative decisions (Levin, 2018). Algorithmic systems may generate decisions through processes that are difficult to document in traditional administrative record formats. Complex machine learning algorithms may rely on patterns in data that cannot be easily translated into verbal explanations suitable for judicial review.

The application of traditional judicial review standards to algorithmic administrative action raises novel questions about the appropriate scope and intensity of judicial oversight. Reasonableness review requires courts to assess whether administrative decisions fall within a range of acceptable outcomes supported by the evidence (Craig, 2019). When algorithmic systems generate decisions based on complex pattern recognition, it becomes difficult for courts to evaluate the reasonableness of particular outcomes without sophisticated technical expertise.

Administrative accountability through internal oversight mechanisms faces similar challenges in algorithmic governance contexts. Traditional approaches to administrative oversight rely on hierarchical review, performance monitoring, and procedural compliance checking (Hood et al., 2000). Algorithmic systems may operate with such speed and complexity that traditional oversight mechanisms cannot keep pace with their decision-making processes.

E. Judicial Review of Algorithmic Administrative Action

The application of judicial review principles to algorithmic administrative action represents an emerging area of legal development with significant implications for administrative law doctrine. Traditional grounds for judicial review, including procedural fairness, reasonableness, and jurisdictional limits, encounter novel challenges when applied to AI-driven administrative decisions. Courts must adapt existing doctrinal frameworks while maintaining the essential

functions of judicial oversight in democratic governance.

Procedural fairness requirements, including the right to be heard and the duty to provide reasons, face particular challenges in algorithmic contexts. The right to be heard presupposes opportunities for affected parties to present relevant information and arguments before administrative decisions are made (Wade & Forsyth, 2014). Algorithmic systems may process information at scales and speeds that make traditional consultation processes impractical or ineffective.

The duty to provide reasons represents a cornerstone of administrative accountability, enabling affected parties to understand the basis for administrative decisions and facilitating effective judicial review (Galligan, 1996). Algorithmic systems that rely on complex machine learning processes may struggle to provide reasons in forms that satisfy traditional legal requirements. Courts must determine whether algorithmic explanations that describe general system behavior satisfy the duty to provide reasons for specific decisions.

Reasonableness review requires courts to assess whether administrative decisions fall within a range of acceptable outcomes based on the relevant law and evidence. When algorithmic systems generate decisions through processes that human reviewers cannot fully understand, courts face challenges in determining whether particular outcomes are reasonable (Wolswinkel, 2022). This difficulty is compounded when algorithmic systems exhibit behaviors that emerge from their training processes rather than explicit programming.

The development of specialized judicial review doctrines for algorithmic administrative action has begun in several jurisdictions, though comprehensive frameworks remain embryonic. Some courts have required agencies to provide enhanced explanations of algorithmic decision-making processes, while others have applied heightened scrutiny to automated administrative systems (Citron, 2008). These developments suggest an evolving judicial approach to algorithmic governance that maintains oversight functions while accommodating technological innovation.

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research employs a multi-method approach combining doctrinal analysis, comparative legal analysis, and critical examination of emerging regulatory frameworks. The methodology is designed to provide comprehensive understanding of how algorithmic rulemaking challenges existing administrative law doctrines and to identify potential solutions for maintaining democratic accountability in AI-driven governance contexts.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

A. Doctrinal Analysis

The doctrinal analysis component examines existing administrative law principles and their application to algorithmic rulemaking contexts. This analysis draws upon established legal sources, including legislation, case law, and authoritative legal commentary, to identify areas where current doctrinal frameworks prove inadequate for addressing AI-related challenges. The analysis focuses particularly on transparency requirements, accountability mechanisms, and judicial review standards as they apply to delegated legislation.

The doctrinal analysis employs systematic examination of legal texts to identify explicit and implicit assumptions about decision-making processes in administrative law. Traditional administrative law doctrines presuppose human decision-makers operating through deliberative processes that can be documented and explained in verbal terms. When algorithmic systems participate in rulemaking, these assumptions may no longer hold, creating gaps in legal coverage that require doctrinal adaptation.

Primary legal sources examined include constitutional provisions establishing administrative authority, statutory frameworks governing rulemaking procedures, and judicial decisions interpreting administrative law requirements. Secondary sources include authoritative legal commentaries, law reform reports, and academic analyses of administrative law development. The analysis identifies specific doctrinal requirements that prove difficult to apply in algorithmic rulemaking contexts and examines potential approaches for adapting these requirements.

B. Comparative Legal Analysis

The comparative component examines how different jurisdictions approach the regulation of AI in administrative contexts, with particular attention to emerging frameworks for algorithmic governance. This analysis draws upon regulatory developments in the European Union, United States, United Kingdom, and other jurisdictions that have begun addressing AI governance challenges. The comparison identifies common themes, divergent approaches, and potential best practices for regulating algorithmic rulemaking.

The European Union's AI Act provides a comprehensive framework for regulating AI applications across various sectors, including public administration (European Commission, 2021). The Act establishes risk-based classifications for AI systems and imposes specific requirements for high-risk applications in public sector contexts. The analysis examines how these requirements apply to rulemaking processes and their potential effectiveness in addressing transparency and accountability challenges.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

United States developments include executive orders establishing principles for AI use in government, agency-specific guidance documents, and emerging judicial precedents addressing algorithmic administrative action (Biden, 2023). The analysis examines how these developments address the specific challenges of algorithmic rulemaking and their compatibility with existing administrative law frameworks.

Other jurisdictions, including Canada, Australia, and various European countries, have developed their own approaches to AI governance that provide additional comparative insights. The analysis identifies common themes across these developments, including emphasis on transparency, human oversight, and accountability mechanisms. Differences in approach reflect varying legal traditions, administrative structures, and policy priorities.

C. Critical Framework Analysis

The critical analysis component examines the effectiveness of existing and proposed regulatory frameworks for addressing the fundamental challenges posed by algorithmic rulemaking. This analysis moves beyond descriptive comparison to evaluate the adequacy of different approaches for maintaining democratic accountability and rule of law principles in AI-driven governance contexts.

The analysis employs normative criteria derived from administrative law theory to assess different regulatory approaches. These criteria include democratic legitimacy, legal accountability, procedural fairness, and substantive reasonableness. The evaluation considers both the theoretical adequacy of different approaches and their practical feasibility given technological and institutional constraints.

Particular attention is paid to identifying trade-offs between different values and objectives in algorithmic governance. Enhanced transparency requirements may conflict with system security or intellectual property protections. Rigorous accountability mechanisms may reduce administrative efficiency or limit beneficial AI applications. The analysis examines how different regulatory frameworks address these trade-offs and their implications for overall governance effectiveness.

D. Case Study Methodology

The research incorporates examination of specific case studies involving algorithmic rulemaking applications to provide concrete examples of the challenges and opportunities presented by AI integration. Case studies are selected to represent different types of algorithmic involvement in rulemaking processes, including data analysis for policy development, automated rule generation, and dynamic rule adjustment systems.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

Case selection criteria include the availability of public information about algorithmic systems, the significance of the regulatory domain, and the representativeness of the AI application type. Priority is given to cases where sufficient information is available to analyze both the technical characteristics of algorithmic systems and their integration with legal and administrative processes.

Each case study examines the specific AI technologies employed, their integration with existing rulemaking procedures, the challenges encountered in ensuring transparency and accountability, and the responses of oversight institutions. The analysis identifies patterns across different case studies and extracts lessons for broader policy development.

IV. Results

A. Transparency Challenges in Algorithmic Rulemaking

The empirical examination reveals that existing transparency requirements prove fundamentally inadequate when applied to algorithmic rulemaking processes. Traditional publication and notification requirements, designed for human-authored rules, fail to provide meaningful insight into AI-driven rulemaking processes. Agencies employing algorithmic systems face difficulties in explaining how AI analyses contribute to regulatory decisions, creating gaps in public understanding that undermine democratic legitimacy.

Current transparency mechanisms in administrative law assume that rulemaking processes can be documented through conventional administrative records consisting of written analyses, expert reports, and deliberative documents (Administrative Conference of the United States, 2020). Algorithmic rulemaking challenges this assumption by introducing decision-making processes that operate through complex mathematical operations rather than verbal reasoning. Machine learning algorithms may identify patterns in data that cannot be easily translated into natural language explanations suitable for public consumption.

The "black box" problem manifests differently in rulemaking contexts compared to individual administrative decisions. While individual decisions affect specific parties who may seek explanations for their particular circumstances, rulemaking affects broad populations with varying levels of technical sophistication and different informational needs (Burrell, 2016). Public consultation processes require information that enables meaningful participation, but algorithmic systems may generate insights that are difficult to communicate in forms accessible to diverse stakeholders.

Agencies have responded to transparency challenges through various approaches, including

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

high-level descriptions of algorithmic processes, publication of summary statistics about AI system performance, and provision of access to training data where legally permissible. However, these approaches often fail to provide sufficient information for meaningful public engagement with algorithmic rulemaking processes. Technical experts may require more detailed information about model architecture and validation procedures, while affected communities may need simplified explanations of how algorithmic analyses affect regulatory outcomes.

The proprietary nature of many AI systems creates additional barriers to transparency in algorithmic rulemaking. Agencies frequently employ AI technologies developed by private contractors who assert intellectual property protections over algorithmic designs and training methodologies (Coglianese, 2021). These assertions create tensions between transparency requirements and contract terms that limit disclosure of technical details about algorithmic operations.

B. Accountability Gaps in AI-Driven Regulatory Processes

The integration of AI systems into rulemaking processes creates significant gaps in traditional accountability mechanisms that rely on identifying responsible human decision-makers and documenting their reasoning processes. Algorithmic systems introduce distributed decision-making processes where responsibility for regulatory outcomes becomes difficult to attribute to specific individuals or institutions. This diffusion of accountability challenges fundamental assumptions underlying administrative oversight and democratic control.

Traditional accountability mechanisms operate through hierarchical structures where senior officials bear responsibility for decisions made by their subordinates according to established procedures and policies (Hood et al., 2000). Algorithmic rulemaking complicates these structures by introducing decision-making processes that operate according to learned patterns rather than explicit policies. When AI systems identify unexpected correlations in data or generate novel regulatory approaches, it becomes difficult to determine whether responsible officials should be held accountable for outcomes they could not have anticipated.

The temporal dimensions of accountability become problematic in algorithmic rulemaking contexts where AI systems may continue learning and adapting after initial deployment. Traditional administrative responsibility assumes that decision-makers can be held accountable for choices made at specific points in time based on information available when decisions were made. Machine learning systems that modify their behavior based on new data inputs challenge this assumption by creating ongoing decision-making processes that extend beyond initial

authorization.

Documentation requirements that support accountability mechanisms encounter technical and practical barriers in algorithmic rulemaking contexts. Administrative records that enable retrospective review of decision-making processes may be difficult to generate when decisions emerge from complex algorithmic processes operating on large datasets. The technical infrastructure required to maintain comprehensive records of algorithmic decision-making may exceed the capabilities of many administrative agencies.

Political accountability through legislative oversight faces particular challenges when algorithmic systems participate in rulemaking processes. Elected officials and their staff may lack the technical expertise necessary to understand and oversee complex AI systems employed by administrative agencies. Traditional oversight mechanisms, such as hearings and document requests, may prove inadequate for evaluating algorithmic rulemaking processes that operate through technical means unfamiliar to political overseers.

C. Judicial Review Challenges and Adaptations

Courts attempting to review algorithmic rulemaking face unprecedented challenges in applying traditional judicial review standards to AI-driven administrative processes. The complexity and opacity of machine learning systems create barriers to effective judicial oversight that threaten fundamental principles of legal accountability and rule of law. However, emerging judicial approaches suggest potential adaptations that could maintain meaningful review while accommodating technological innovation.

The application of reasonableness standards to algorithmic rulemaking requires courts to assess whether AI-driven regulatory decisions fall within acceptable ranges of outcomes supported by relevant evidence and legal authority. This assessment becomes problematic when algorithmic systems reach conclusions through processes that human reviewers cannot fully understand or evaluate. Courts must determine whether algorithmic outputs can be considered reasonable without being able to trace the specific reasoning processes that generated them.

Procedural review of algorithmic rulemaking encounters similar challenges in ensuring that AI systems comply with required consultation processes, consider relevant factors, and provide adequate explanations for regulatory decisions. Traditional procedural requirements assume human decision-makers who can consciously address procedural obligations and document their compliance. Algorithmic systems may satisfy procedural requirements in technical senses while failing to achieve the underlying purposes of ensuring fair process and meaningful participation.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

Some courts have begun developing approaches that acknowledge the unique characteristics of algorithmic administrative action while maintaining essential oversight functions. Enhanced disclosure requirements may mandate that agencies provide more detailed information about algorithmic systems than would be required for traditional administrative processes (Citron & Pasquale, 2014). Specialized technical expertise may be required through expert witnesses or court-appointed technical advisors who can help courts understand complex AI systems.

The development of algorithmic auditing procedures represents a promising approach for enabling effective judicial review of AI-driven administrative processes. Independent technical audits can evaluate algorithmic systems for bias, accuracy, and compliance with legal requirements in ways that traditional judicial review cannot accomplish. Courts may rely on audit findings while maintaining their traditional role in interpreting legal requirements and ensuring procedural compliance.

D. Emerging Regulatory Frameworks and Their Effectiveness

Analysis of emerging regulatory frameworks reveals diverse approaches to addressing algorithmic governance challenges, with varying degrees of attention to the specific context of rulemaking processes. The European Union's AI Act provides the most comprehensive framework for regulating AI in public administration, though its application to rulemaking processes remains largely untested. Other jurisdictions have developed more limited approaches that address specific aspects of algorithmic governance without comprehensive integration with administrative law principles.

The EU AI Act establishes risk-based classifications that subject high-risk AI systems to enhanced requirements for transparency, accuracy, and human oversight (European Commission, 2021). AI systems used in public administration for tasks that significantly affect individual rights qualify as high-risk applications subject to strict requirements. However, the Act's application to rulemaking processes, which affect populations rather than individuals, creates interpretive challenges that remain unresolved in implementing guidance.

United States developments focus primarily on executive orders and agency guidance rather than comprehensive legislation. Executive Order 14110 establishes principles for AI use in government that include requirements for testing, monitoring, and human oversight of AI systems (Biden, 2023). However, these requirements apply broadly to AI use in government without specific attention to the unique characteristics of rulemaking processes. Agency-specific guidance documents provide more detailed requirements but lack consistency across the federal government.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

The effectiveness of existing regulatory frameworks in addressing algorithmic rulemaking challenges appears limited by their focus on individual decisions rather than systemic rulemaking processes. Most frameworks address algorithmic systems that make determinations about specific individuals or entities, such as benefit eligibility or enforcement actions. The broader challenges of ensuring democratic accountability in AI-driven rulemaking processes receive less attention in current regulatory approaches.

Comparative analysis reveals that no jurisdiction has yet developed comprehensive frameworks specifically designed to address algorithmic rulemaking challenges. This gap reflects both the novelty of AI applications in rulemaking contexts and the complexity of integrating technological innovation with established administrative law principles. Future regulatory development will likely require more targeted approaches that address the specific characteristics of algorithmic rulemaking rather than treating it as a subset of broader AI governance.

V. DISCUSSION

A. Fundamental Tensions Between AI Innovation and Democratic Principles

The integration of algorithmic systems into rulemaking processes creates fundamental tensions between the efficiency and analytical capabilities that AI technologies offer and the democratic principles that underpin legitimate administrative governance. These tensions are not merely technical challenges to be solved through better algorithms or enhanced transparency mechanisms. Rather, they reflect deeper questions about the appropriate role of automated systems in democratic decision-making and the extent to which traditional notions of accountability and participation must evolve to accommodate technological innovation.

The efficiency gains that algorithmic rulemaking promises are substantial and increasingly attractive to resource-constrained administrative agencies. AI systems can process vast quantities of data to identify patterns and trends that human analysts might miss, operate continuously without fatigue or emotional bias, and generate regulatory responses more quickly than traditional deliberative processes allow (Coglianese, 2021). These capabilities are particularly valuable in rapidly evolving regulatory environments where traditional rulemaking processes may be too slow to address emerging challenges effectively.

However, these efficiency gains come at potential costs to democratic legitimacy that cannot be easily dismissed or technological resolved. Democratic governance requires more than technically optimal outcomes; it requires that regulatory decisions emerge from processes that enable meaningful public participation, maintain accountability to affected communities, and

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

preserve the possibility of political oversight and control (Dahl, 1989). When algorithmic systems participate substantially in rulemaking processes, these democratic requirements face significant challenges that existing legal frameworks struggle to address.

The challenge is particularly acute because the benefits of algorithmic rulemaking and the costs to democratic accountability may not be evenly distributed across different contexts or populations. AI systems may improve regulatory outcomes for some affected communities while creating barriers to participation or understanding for others. Technical communities and well-resourced stakeholders may be better positioned to engage with algorithmic rulemaking processes than communities that lack technical expertise or resources. This uneven distribution of costs and benefits raises fundamental questions about fairness and democratic inclusion that require careful consideration in policy development.

The temporal dimensions of this tension add additional complexity to the challenge of maintaining democratic accountability in algorithmic rulemaking. Traditional rulemaking processes operate through discrete phases that enable stakeholder engagement, deliberative consideration, and political oversight at specific points in time. Algorithmic systems may operate continuously, learning from new data and adjusting their outputs in ways that blur the boundaries between initial rule creation and ongoing implementation (Engstrom et al., 2020). This continuous operation challenges traditional notions of when democratic input should occur and how ongoing accountability should be maintained.

B. Reconceptualizing Transparency for the Algorithmic Age

Traditional transparency requirements in administrative law rest on assumptions about human cognition and communication that may not apply to algorithmic decision-making processes. The duty to provide reasons assumes that decision-makers can articulate their reasoning in natural language forms that enable public understanding and judicial review. Publication requirements assume that regulatory documents can convey the essential information necessary for public participation and oversight. These assumptions encounter significant challenges when algorithmic systems participate in rulemaking through processes that operate through mathematical operations rather than verbal reasoning.

The concept of explainable AI (XAI) offers potential solutions to transparency challenges, but current XAI technologies have significant limitations that affect their suitability for democratic governance contexts. Most XAI approaches provide post-hoc explanations that approximate algorithmic decision-making processes rather than revealing the actual causal mechanisms that generated specific outcomes (Wachter et al., 2017). These approximations may be sufficient for

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

some technical purposes but may not satisfy legal requirements for reasoned explanation or enable meaningful public participation in rulemaking processes.

The development of transparency requirements appropriate for algorithmic rulemaking must consider the diverse informational needs of different stakeholders in democratic governance. Technical experts require detailed information about algorithmic architectures, training data, and validation procedures that enable them to assess system performance and identify potential problems. Affected communities require simplified explanations that help them understand how algorithmic analyses affect regulatory outcomes without requiring technical expertise. Oversight institutions require information that enables them to fulfill their supervisory functions while recognizing their own technical limitations.

A multi-layered approach to transparency may better serve these diverse needs than attempts to develop universal explanation standards that satisfy all stakeholders. Technical documentation could provide detailed information for expert review while summary explanations address broader public information needs. Interactive systems could enable stakeholders to explore algorithmic outputs at different levels of detail according to their interests and capabilities. However, such approaches require careful design to ensure that simplified explanations accurately represent underlying algorithmic processes rather than creating misleading impressions about system behavior.

The proprietary nature of many AI systems creates additional challenges for developing appropriate transparency requirements that must be addressed through policy choices about intellectual property protections and public access to information. Current approaches that rely on trade secret protections for algorithmic systems may be incompatible with democratic transparency requirements, particularly when AI systems play substantial roles in rulemaking processes. Alternative approaches, such as mandatory disclosure for public sector applications or independent auditing procedures, may better balance innovation incentives with democratic accountability needs.

C. Adaptive Accountability Mechanisms for Algorithmic Governance

Traditional accountability mechanisms in administrative law assume that responsibility for regulatory decisions can be attributed to identifiable human decision-makers who can be held accountable through political, legal, and administrative oversight processes. Algorithmic rulemaking challenges these assumptions by introducing distributed decision-making processes where responsibility for outcomes may be difficult to attribute to specific individuals or institutions. This challenge requires adaptive accountability mechanisms that maintain

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

democratic control while accommodating the technical realities of AI-driven governance.

The concept of algorithmic accountability encompasses multiple dimensions that require different approaches and may involve trade-offs among competing values. Technical accountability involves ensuring that algorithmic systems perform according to their intended specifications and do not exhibit harmful biases or errors. Legal accountability involves ensuring that algorithmic rulemaking complies with procedural requirements and substantive legal standards. Democratic accountability involves maintaining meaningful political control over algorithmic systems and ensuring that their use serves public purposes rather than narrow technical or administrative objectives.

Human oversight requirements represent one approach to maintaining accountability in algorithmic rulemaking contexts, but the design of effective oversight mechanisms requires careful attention to both technical capabilities and institutional constraints. Meaningful human oversight requires that human decision-makers possess sufficient understanding of algorithmic systems to exercise informed judgment about their outputs and limitations. However, the complexity of modern AI systems may exceed the technical capabilities of many administrative officials, creating challenges for implementing effective oversight requirements.

The development of specialized institutional capabilities may be necessary to support effective accountability in algorithmic governance contexts. Technical audit functions could provide independent assessment of algorithmic systems used in rulemaking processes, offering expertise that traditional oversight institutions may lack. Algorithmic impact assessment procedures could evaluate the broader consequences of AI system deployment for democratic governance and affected communities. These specialized capabilities would complement rather than replace traditional accountability mechanisms by providing technical expertise necessary for effective oversight.

The temporal dimensions of accountability in algorithmic rulemaking require particular attention to the ongoing nature of machine learning systems that continue to evolve after initial deployment. Traditional accountability mechanisms operate through discrete episodes of oversight and correction that assume stable decision-making processes. Continuous monitoring and adjustment procedures may be necessary to maintain accountability for algorithmic systems that modify their behavior based on new data inputs or changing environmental conditions.

D. Judicial Review in the Age of Algorithmic Administration

The adaptation of judicial review doctrines to algorithmic administrative action represents one of the most challenging aspects of maintaining rule of law principles in AI-driven governance

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

contexts. Courts must develop approaches that enable meaningful oversight of algorithmic rulemaking while recognizing their own limitations in understanding complex technical systems. This adaptation requires careful balance between maintaining essential judicial functions and avoiding inappropriate judicial intrusion into technical domains beyond court competence.

The application of reasonableness standards to algorithmic rulemaking requires courts to assess whether AI-driven regulatory decisions fall within acceptable ranges of outcomes without necessarily understanding the specific technical processes that generated those outcomes. This assessment may require courts to focus more heavily on outcomes and less on processes than traditional administrative law review. However, pure outcome-based review may be insufficient to detect systematic problems with algorithmic systems that affect their overall reliability or fairness.

Procedural review of algorithmic rulemaking faces similar challenges in ensuring that AI systems comply with required consultation processes and consider relevant factors in their analyses. Courts must determine whether algorithmic compliance with procedural requirements satisfies the underlying purposes of ensuring fair process and meaningful participation. This determination may require courts to look beyond formal compliance to assess whether algorithmic systems actually enable effective public engagement and deliberative consideration.

The development of specialized technical expertise within judicial systems may be necessary to enable effective review of algorithmic administrative action. Court-appointed technical experts could provide independent assessment of algorithmic systems and their compliance with legal requirements. Specialized administrative courts with enhanced technical capabilities could develop expertise in algorithmic governance issues while maintaining appropriate separation from policy-making functions. However, such developments must be carefully designed to preserve judicial independence and avoid inappropriate judicial involvement in technical administration.

The role of algorithmic auditing in judicial review represents a promising approach for combining technical expertise with traditional judicial oversight functions. Independent technical audits can assess algorithmic systems for compliance with legal requirements, accuracy in performance, and absence of harmful biases in ways that traditional judicial review cannot accomplish. Courts can rely on audit findings while maintaining their traditional roles in interpreting legal requirements and ensuring procedural compliance. This division of labor may enable more effective oversight while respecting the limitations of judicial institutions in

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

technical domains.

E. International Dimensions and Comparative Approaches

The global nature of AI technologies and the interconnectedness of modern regulatory challenges create important international dimensions to the governance of algorithmic rulemaking that require consideration alongside domestic legal developments. Different jurisdictions are developing varying approaches to AI governance that reflect different legal traditions, institutional structures, and policy priorities. These differences create both opportunities for learning from comparative experience and challenges for coordination in areas where regulatory consistency may be important.

The European Union's comprehensive approach through the AI Act establishes detailed requirements for AI systems used in public administration, including transparency obligations, accuracy requirements, and human oversight provisions (European Commission, 2021). This approach reflects broader European traditions of comprehensive regulation and rights-based approaches to technology governance. However, the practical implementation of these requirements in rulemaking contexts remains largely untested, and their effectiveness in maintaining democratic accountability while enabling beneficial AI applications is uncertain.

The United States approach emphasizes executive orders, agency guidance, and market-based solutions rather than comprehensive legislation. This approach reflects American traditions of regulatory flexibility and technological innovation but may create consistency challenges across different agencies and regulatory domains. The fragmented nature of US AI governance may limit its effectiveness in addressing systemic challenges that cross agency boundaries or require coordinated responses.

Other jurisdictions, including Canada, the United Kingdom, and various developing countries, are developing their own approaches that reflect their particular circumstances and regulatory capabilities. These diverse approaches provide opportunities for policy learning and experimentation that may inform future development of international best practices. However, they also create challenges for international coordination in areas where AI systems operate across borders or where regulatory consistency may be important for trade and investment.

The potential for international cooperation in algorithmic governance includes both technical cooperation in developing standards and evaluation procedures and legal cooperation in developing compatible regulatory frameworks. Technical standards for AI transparency, accountability, and performance could facilitate international cooperation while respecting different policy approaches. Legal cooperation could address cross-border challenges such as

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

jurisdiction over AI systems operated by multinational corporations or coordination of enforcement actions against harmful AI applications.

VI. CONCLUSION

This research demonstrates that algorithmic rulemaking presents fundamental challenges to traditional administrative law doctrines that require careful adaptation rather than wholesale replacement of existing governance frameworks. The integration of AI systems into rulemaking processes creates unprecedented challenges for transparency, accountability, and judicial review that existing legal mechanisms struggle to address effectively. However, these challenges are not insurmountable if approached through thoughtful adaptation of administrative law principles combined with development of new institutional capabilities and procedural requirements specifically designed for algorithmic governance contexts.

The central finding of this research is that current administrative law frameworks prove inadequate for addressing algorithmic rulemaking challenges primarily because they assume human decision-making processes that can be documented, explained, and reviewed through traditional legal mechanisms. When algorithmic systems participate substantially in rulemaking through complex mathematical operations rather than verbal reasoning, these assumptions no longer hold, creating gaps in legal coverage that threaten democratic accountability and rule of law principles.

The analysis reveals that transparency requirements face particular challenges in algorithmic rulemaking contexts where traditional publication and explanation requirements fail to provide meaningful public access to information about AI-driven regulatory processes. The "black box" problem is not merely a technical limitation to be solved through better algorithms, but reflects fundamental challenges in translating mathematical operations into natural language explanations suitable for democratic discourse. Future transparency requirements must accommodate these limitations while ensuring that democratic participation and oversight remain meaningful.

Accountability mechanisms encounter similar challenges in algorithmic rulemaking contexts where responsibility for regulatory outcomes becomes difficult to attribute to specific human decision-makers. The distributed nature of algorithmic decision-making and the continuous learning capabilities of AI systems challenge traditional approaches to administrative responsibility that assume discrete decision-making episodes by identifiable officials. Adaptive accountability mechanisms must maintain democratic control while accommodating the technical realities of AI-driven governance.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

Judicial review faces unprecedented challenges in applying traditional oversight standards to algorithmic administrative action, but emerging approaches suggest potential adaptations that could maintain meaningful legal oversight. Enhanced technical expertise within judicial systems, combined with independent algorithmic auditing procedures, may enable more effective review while respecting the limitations of judicial institutions in technical domains. These developments represent promising directions for maintaining rule of law principles in algorithmic governance contexts.

The comparative analysis reveals that no jurisdiction has yet developed comprehensive frameworks specifically designed to address algorithmic rulemaking challenges, reflecting both the novelty of AI applications in rulemaking contexts and the complexity of integrating technological innovation with established administrative law principles. Future regulatory development will likely require more targeted approaches that address the specific characteristics of algorithmic rulemaking rather than treating it as a subset of broader AI governance.

Several recommendations emerge from this analysis for policy development and future research. First, administrative law frameworks require targeted adaptations that address the specific challenges of algorithmic rulemaking while preserving core democratic values. These adaptations should include enhanced transparency requirements that accommodate the technical limitations of AI explanation while providing meaningful public access to information, adaptive accountability mechanisms that maintain democratic control over algorithmic systems, and modified judicial review standards that enable effective legal oversight while respecting judicial limitations in technical domains.

Second, the development of specialized institutional capabilities appears necessary to support effective governance of algorithmic rulemaking. Technical audit functions, algorithmic impact assessment procedures, and enhanced oversight capabilities may be required to supplement traditional accountability mechanisms with expertise appropriate for AI-driven governance contexts. These institutional developments should complement rather than replace traditional democratic oversight while providing technical capabilities necessary for effective governance.

Third, international cooperation in developing standards and compatible regulatory frameworks could facilitate effective governance of algorithmic systems that operate across borders while respecting different national approaches to AI governance. Technical standards for transparency, accountability, and performance could support international cooperation while maintaining regulatory sovereignty and policy flexibility.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

Finally, future research should focus on developing more nuanced understanding of how different types of algorithmic systems affect administrative law requirements in different regulatory contexts. The broad category of "algorithmic rulemaking" encompasses diverse technical approaches and regulatory applications that may require different legal treatments. Detailed case studies of specific algorithmic applications in rulemaking contexts could inform more targeted policy development and legal adaptation.

The broader implications of this research extend beyond administrative law to encompass fundamental questions about the role of automated systems in democratic governance. As AI technologies become more sophisticated and their applications in governance contexts expand, maintaining democratic accountability and rule of law principles will require ongoing adaptation of legal frameworks and institutional capabilities. The challenge is not to prevent technological innovation in governance, but to ensure that such innovation serves democratic purposes and remains subject to appropriate legal and political control.

The future of algorithmic rulemaking will likely depend on the ability of legal and political institutions to adapt to technological change while maintaining their essential functions in democratic governance. This adaptation requires both technical sophistication in understanding AI systems and their capabilities, and normative clarity about the values and principles that should guide their use in public administration. Neither purely technical nor purely legal approaches will be sufficient; effective governance of algorithmic rulemaking will require interdisciplinary collaboration that combines technical expertise with legal and political understanding.

The stakes of this challenge are substantial. Algorithmic rulemaking has the potential to improve regulatory governance through enhanced accuracy, consistency, and responsiveness to changing conditions. However, if implemented without appropriate legal safeguards and democratic oversight, it also has the potential to undermine fundamental principles of accountable government and public participation in regulatory decision-making. The path forward requires careful balance between embracing beneficial innovation and preserving essential democratic values.

*****

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

VII. REFERENCES

1. Administrative Conference of the United States. (2020). *Government by algorithm: Artificial intelligence in federal administrative agencies*. https://www.acus.gov/report/government-algorithm-artificial-intelligence-federal-administrative-agencies
2. Angwin, J., Larson, J., Mattu, S., & Kirchner, L. (2016). Machine bias: There's software used across the country to predict future criminals: And it's biased against blacks. *ProPublica*. https://www.propublica.org/article/machine-bias-risk-assessments-in-criminal-sentencing
3. Baeyens, A. (2019). Administrative law and the machines of government: Judicial review of automated public-sector decision-making. *Legal Studies*, 39(4), 636-655. https://doi.org/10.1017/lst.2019.9
4. Baldwin, R., Cave, M., & Lodge, M. (2012). *Understanding regulation: Theory, strategy, and practice* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
5. Balkin, J. M. (2017). Data law and policy: The three laws of robotics in the age of big data. *Ohio State Law Journal*, 78(6), 1217-1241. https://openyls.law.yale.edu/handle/20.500.13051/4697?show=full
6. Biden, J. R. (2023, October 30). Executive Order on the safe, secure, and trustworthy development and use of artificial intelligence. *Federal Register*, 88(219), 75191-75216.
7. Bridges v. Chief Constable of South Wales Police [2020] EWCA Civ 1058.
8. Bignami, F. (2022). Artificial intelligence accountability of public administration. *The American Journal of Comparative Law*, *70*(Supplement_1), i312-i346. https://doi.org/10.1093/ajcl/avac012
9. Burrell, J. (2016). How the machine 'thinks': Understanding opacity in machine learning algorithms. *Big Data & Society*, 3(1), 1-12. https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951715622512
10. Castets-Renard, C. (2021). Comparing European and Canadian AI regulation. *Law Commission of Ontario*. https://www.lco-cdo.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/Comparing-European-and-Canadian-AI-Regulation-Final-November-2021.pdf
11. Citron, D. K. (2008). Technological due process. *Washington University Law Review*, 85(6), 1249-1313 https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1166&context=law_lawreview

12. Citron, D. K., & Pasquale, F. (2014). The scored society: Due process for automated predictions. *Washington Law Review*, 89(1), 1-33. https://digitalcommons.law.uw.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=4796&context=wlr

13. Cobbe, J. (2019). Administrative law and the machines of government: Judicial review of automated public-sector decision-making. *Legal Studies*, 39(4), 636-655. https://doi.org/10.1017/lst.2019.12

14. Coglianese, C. (2021). Administrative law in the automated state. *Daedalus*, 150(3), 104-120. https://doi.org/10.1162/daed_a_01862

15. Coglianese, C., & Lehr, D. (2017). Regulating by robot: Administrative decision making in the machine-learning era. *Georgetown Law Journal*, 105(4), 1147-1223. https://scholarship.law.upenn.edu/faculty_scholarship/1734/

16. Craig, P. (2019). *Administrative law* (8th ed.). Sweet & Maxwell.

17. Craig, P., & De Búrca, G. (2020). *EU law: Text, cases, and materials* (7th ed.). Oxford University Press.

18. Dahl, R. A. (1989). *Democracy and its critics*. Yale University Press. https://www.jstor.org/stable/1289333

19. Diakopoulos, N. (2016). Accountability in algorithmic decision making. *Communications of the ACM*, 59(2), 56-62. https://doi.org/10.1145/2844110

20. Chng, K. (2024). Re-examining judicial review of delegated legislation. *Legal Studies*, *44*(1), 81-98. https://doi.org/10.1017/lst.2023.7

21. Engstrom, D. F., Ho, D. E., Sharkey, C. M., & Cuéllar, M. F. (2020). *Government by algorithm: Artificial intelligence in federal administrative agencies*. Stanford University & New York University. http://complaw.stanford.edu/readings/government_by_algorithm.pdf

22. European Commission. (2021). *Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act)*. COM(2021) 206 final. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52021PC0206

23. Fagan, F., & Levmore, S. (2019). The impact of artificial intelligence on rules, standards, and judicial discretion. *University of Chicago Law Review*, 86(4), 901-940. https://chicagounbound.uchicago.edu/public_law_and_legal_theory/794/

24. Finck, M. (2020). Automated decision-making and administrative law. In P. Cane, H. C. H. Hofmann, E. C. Ip, & P. L. Lindseth (Eds.), *Oxford handbook of comparative administrative law* (pp. 675-690). Oxford University Press.

25. Fleming, L., Ghazi, T., & Russell, M. (2023). Parliamentary scrutiny of delegated legislation: Lessons from comparative experience. *The Political Quarterly*, 94(2), 234-244. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-923X.13290

26. Fortes, P. R. B. (2020). Paths to digital justice: Judicial robots, algorithmic decision-making, and due process. *Asian Journal of Law and Society*, 7(3), 453-477. https://doi.org/10.1017/als.2020.12

27. Freeman, K. (2016). Algorithmic injustice: How the Wisconsin Supreme Court failed to protect due process rights in State v. Loomis. *North Carolina Journal of Law & Technology*, 18(1), 75-106. https://scholarship.law.unc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1332&context=ncjolt

28. Galligan, D. J. (1996). *Due process and fair procedures: A study of administrative procedures*. Clarendon Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198256762.001.0001

29. Goldberg v. Kelly, 397 U.S. 254 (1970).

30. Goodman, B., & Flaxman, S. (2017). EU regulations on algorithmic decision-making and a "right to explanation." *AI Magazine*, 38(3), 50-57. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1609/aimag.v38i3.2741?msockid=193be71ff8de6e7f3d7cf4a7f9956fdf

31. Greenstein, S. (2021). Preserving the rule of law in the era of artificial intelligence (AI). *Artificial Intelligence and Law*, 29(4), 463-485. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10506-021-09294-4

32. Hill, R. (2016). What an algorithm is. *Philosophy Compass*, 11(1), 35-47. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-014-0184-5

33. Hood, C., James, O., Jones, G., Scott, C., & Travers, T. (2000). *Regulation inside government: Waste-watchers, quality police, and sleaze-busters*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/0198280998.001.0001

34. Houston Federation of Teachers v. Houston Independent School District, 251 F. Supp. 3d 1168 (S.D. Tex. 2017).

35. Kaminski, M. E. (2019). The right to explanation, explained. *Berkeley Technology Law Journal*, 34(1), 189-218. https://doi.org/10.15779/Z38TD9N83H

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

36. Keyes, J. M. (2015). Judicial review of delegated legislation: Whatever happened to the standard of review? *Ottawa Faculty of Law Working Paper No. 2015-3*. https://ssrn.com/abstract=2559999

37. Levin, R. M. (2018). *Administrative law and regulation: Cases and materials* (3rd ed.). Foundation Press.

38. McCubbins, M. D., Noll, R. G., & Weingast, B. R. (1987). Administrative procedures as instruments of political control. *Journal of Law, Economics, & Organization*, 3(2), 243-277. http://www.jstor.org/stable/764829?origin=JSTOR-pdf

39. Miller, T. (2019). Explanation in artificial intelligence: Insights from the social sciences. *Artificial Intelligence*, 267, 1-38. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.artint.2018.07.007

40. Mulligan, D. K., & Bamberger, K. A. (2019). Procurement as policy: Administrative process for machine learning. *Berkeley Technology Law Journal*, 34(3), 773-858. https://btlj.org/data/articles2019/34_3/03_Mulligan_Web.pdf

41. OECD. (2021). *OECD AI principles overview*. https://oecd.ai/en/ai-principles

42. Page, A. (2024). Judicial review challenges to secondary legislation in England and Wales: Courting controversy. *Statute Law Review*, 45(1), 89-112. https://doi.org/10.1093/slr/hmae010

43. Pasquale, F. (2015). *The black box society: The secret algorithms that control money and information*. Harvard University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/beq.2016.50

44. Ribeiro, M.T., Singh, S. and Guestrin, C. (2016) "Why Should I Trust You?": Explaining the Predictions of Any Classifier. Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, San Francisco, 13-17 August 2016, 1135-1144. https://doi.org/10.1145/2939672.2939778

45. Selbst, A. D., & Powles, J. (2017). Meaningful information and the right to explanation. *International Data Privacy Law*, 7(4), 233-242. https://doi.org/10.1093/idpl/ipx022

46. Sourdin, T., & Cornes, R. (2018). Judge v robot? Artificial intelligence and judicial decision-making, https://www.judcom.nsw.gov.au/publications/benchbks/judicial_officers/judge_v_robot.html

47. State v. Loomis, 881 N.W.2d 749 (Wis. 2016).

48. Sunstein, C. R. (2021). *Sludge: What stops us from getting things done and what to do about it*. MIT Press. https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/13859.001.0001

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

49. The Citizen Lab. (2018). *Bots at the gate: A human rights analysis of automated decision-making in Canada's immigration and refugee system*. University of Toronto. https://citizenlab.ca/2018/09/bots-at-the-gate-human-rights-analysis-automated-decision-making-in-canadas-immigration-refugee-system/

50. UNESCO. (2021). *Recommendation on the ethics of artificial intelligence*. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000381137

51. Van Ooijen, C., & Ubaldi, B. (2018). A data-driven public sector: Enabling the strategic use of data for productive, inclusive and trustworthy governance. *OECD Working Papers on Public Governance*, No. 33. https://doi.org/10.1787/09ab162c-en

52. Wachter, S., Mittelstadt, B., & Floridi, L. (2017). Why a right to explanation of automated decision-making does not exist in the General Data Protection Regulation. *International Data Privacy Law*, 7(2), 76-99. https://doi.org/10.1093/idpl/ipx005

53. Wade, W., & Forsyth, C. (2014). *Administrative law* (11th ed.). Oxford University Press.

54. Wolswinkel, J. (2022). Artificial intelligence and administrative law. *Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing*. https://www.coe.int/documents/22298481/0/CDCJ%282022%2931E+-+FINAL+6.pdf/4cb20e4b-3da9-d4d4-2da0-65c11cd16116?t=1670943260563

55. Yeung, K. (2019). Regulation by blockchain: The emerging battle for supremacy between the code of law and code as law. *Modern Law Review*, 82(2), 207-239. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2230.12399

56. Zalnieriute, M., Moses, L. B., & Williams, G. (2019). The rule of law and automation of government decision-making. *Modern Law Review*, 82(3), 425-455. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2230.12412

*****

 [ISSN 2581-5369]