The delicate balance between artificial intelligence efficiency and legal principles in administrative decision-making

L'équilibre délicat entre l'efficacité de l'intelligence artificielle et les principes juridiques dans la prise de décision administrative

Cheref Chahinez

Higher School of Equipment/ El Harrach- Algiers
cherefchahinez79@gmail.com

Date of submission:14/03/2024 Date of final acceptance:29/06/2024 Date of publication :juine 2024

Abstract:

The subject of harmonizing the efficiency of artificial intelligence (AI) with foundational legal principles within the realm of administrative decision-making delves into both the complexities and potential benefits that emerge as AI becomes increasingly integrated into government decision-making frameworks. AI's incorporation offers notable advantages in terms of enhanced efficiency and precision. However, it simultaneously prompts concerns regarding transparency, accountability, and adherence to established legal norms. The focal point of research in this domain is to identify a nuanced equilibrium between the proficient deployment of AI technologies and the strict observance of core legal values, thereby ensuring governance that is both just and equitable. The establishment of robust mechanisms for control, oversight, and transparency is crucial in ensuring that AI-assisted decisions not only respect but also embody legal principles, all the while optimizing the benefits this technology affords.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Administrative Decision-Making, Legal Compliance, Equitable Governance, Transparency.

Résumé :

Le thème de l'équilibre entre l'efficacité de l'intelligence artificielle (IA) et les principes juridiques dans la prise de décision administrative explore les défis et les opportunités résultant de l'intégration croissante de l'IA dans les processus décisionnels gouvernementaux. Alors que l'IA offre des avantages en termes d'efficacité et de précision, elle soulève des préoccupations liées à la transparence, à la responsabilité et à la conformité aux normes juridiques. La recherche dans ce domaine vise à trouver un équilibre délicat entre l'utilisation efficace de l'IA et le respect des principes juridiques fondamentaux pour garantir une gouvernance juste et équitable. Des mécanismes de contrôle, de surveillance et de transparence sont essentiels pour assurer que les décisions prises avec l'IA respectent les principes juridiques tout en exploitant pleinement le potentiel de cette technologie.

Mots clés : Intelligence Artificielle, Prise de décision administrative, Conformité juridique, Gouvernance équitable, Transparence.

Auteur correspondant :cheref chahinez

Introduction:

At the heart of public authority within a structured society lies administrative decision-making. This pivotal process involves choosing among multiple options to influence the rights, duties, or interests of community members, balancing diverse societal interests against the legal and ethical frameworks that underpin state operations. Administrative decision-making is grounded in legal principles ensuring legitimacy, transparency, and fairness.

Over time, legal systems have evolved to incorporate procedural safeguards protecting individual rights and preventing authority misuse, including the right to an effective remedy, the right to be heard, and the ability to challenge decisions in independent forums. Thus, administrative decision-making seeks to reconcile state power with individual rights, aiming for a just and equitable exercise of public authority.

However, the emergence of artificial intelligence (AI) represents a transformative shift, promising unparalleled efficiency, vast data processing capabilities, and the automation of decision-making processes. AI's prowess in data analysis and interpretation is revolutionizing strategic decision-making, prompting profound contemplation on its integration with established legal principles.

AI's contribution to administrative decision-making, while immensely beneficial in enhancing process speed, reducing human error, and optimizing resource distribution, must not overlook the fundamental tenets that govern such decisions. The susceptibility of AI algorithms to inherent data biases, with potential fairness and discrimination implications, necessitates a harmonious balance between AI's efficiency and legal principle adherence. Ensuring the legality and legitimacy of AI-driven decisions, along with algorithm transparency and the provision for effective remedy, is imperative for enabling individuals to challenge AI-made decisions.

Incorporating AI into administrative decision-making thus represents a critical juncture between the pursuit of enhanced efficiency and the commitment to fundamental legal principles. This discourse warrants an extensive evaluation of bias risks, the establishment of adequate accountability frameworks, and the revision of existing legal structures. Through this examination, we can elucidate how AI can be implemented within administrative processes in a manner that safeguards the legal framework's integrity while capitalizing on the significant advantages this nascent technology offers.

Importance of the topic

The intersection between artificial intelligence (AI) and administrative decision-making represents a critical crossroad where technological advancements meet the legal foundations of our modern societies. This union raises crucial issues, mixing the undeniable efficiency of AI with the imperative need to ensure legality, legitimacy, and fairness in governmental decision-making processes.

Study problem

This fusion between AI efficiency and fundamental legal principles raises a complex problem:

- **How to balance the transformative power of AI with the fundamental principles guiding administrative decision-making?**

Beyond the central problem that questions the delicate balance between the efficiency of artificial intelligence (AI) and legal principles in administrative decision-making, our investigation

will reveal several secondary issues that will enrich our overall understanding of this complex dynamic.

These secondary axes, while related to our fundamental question, explore specific and essential facets of this convergence between emerging technology and the established legal framework:

How to ensure that the integration of AI in administrative decision-making does not compromise individual rights, transparency, and fairness inherent in a democratic system?

The rapid advances in AI, although promising in terms of process optimization, can also carry risks, such as algorithmic biases and the loss of human control. Therefore, how to establish a fair balance between technological efficiency and legal imperatives to ensure informed, ethical, and standards-compliant administrative decision-making?

Methodology

Our methodological approach is based on two complementary pillars: a thorough theoretical analysis of legal foundations and a targeted case study to contextualize the practical implications of integrating artificial intelligence (AI) into administrative decision-making.

Plan

Introduction

- Contextualization of the problem: balance between the transformative power of AI and the fundamental principles of administrative decision-making.
- Highlighting the ethical and legal stakes related to the integration of AI in public administration.

Part I: Impact of artificial intelligence on administrative decision-making

A. Analysis of the advantages and challenges of AI in the administrative decision-making process.
B. Exploration of potential risks such as algorithmic biases and the loss of human control.

Part II: Legal Principles and Procedural Safeguards to Frame the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Administrative Decision-Making

A. Relevant legal principles for administrative decision-making.

B. Procedural safeguards to ensure a fair decision-making process

Conclusion

Legal Framework and Recommendations for Responsible Use of Artificial Intelligence.

A. Evaluation of existing legal frameworks internationally to frame the use of AI.
B. Presentation of key recommendations to ensure responsible, ethical, and democratic standards-compliant use of artificial intelligence in administrative decision-making

Part I: The impact of artificial intelligence on administrative decision-making

Just as its use in administrative decision-making, AI is evolving rapidly. Public administrations are increasingly discovering the potential of AI systems to facilitate decision-making processes and enhance the relevance of administrative decisions.

Concurrently, the growing interest in AI applications raises the question, among many other legal issues, of whether existing administrative law rules and principles are robust, directive, and durable enough to effectively regulate this new form of decision-making, given concerns raised by AI systems regarding privacy, discrimination, proportionality, and the guarantee of due process. [1]While some see AI as a tool for assistance, others fear it may replace human judgment, with all the ethical implications that entails. In this part, we will explore this evolving dynamic, highlighting the opportunities and challenges that AI presents.

A. Analysis of the Advantages and Challenges of AI in the Administrative Decision-Making Process.

The utilization of artificial intelligence (AI) in administrative decision-making is undergoing rapid evolution. Public administration entities are increasingly recognizing the capacity of AI systems to streamline decision-making processes and augment the pertinence of administrative resolutions.

Alongside this growing inclination towards AI applications, there emerges a pivotal question amid numerous legal considerations: Are the extant rules and principles of administrative law sufficiently robust, prescriptive, and enduring to aptly govern this emergent mode of decision-making, especially in light of concerns regarding privacy, discrimination, proportionality, and the safeguarding of due process presented by AI systems?

While some view AI as a beneficial auxiliary tool, there is apprehension that it might supplant human discretion, carrying significant ethical ramifications. This section endeavors to dissect the shifting landscape, accentuating both the prospects and impediments AI introduces.

1. **Education and continuous training:** It is essential for board members to understand the basics of AI, its potential benefits, and its risks. Regular training sessions can help demystify the technology and strengthen confidence in its use.
2. **Collaboration with AI experts:** Companies should consider collaborating with AI experts to develop and refine their algorithms. These experts can provide valuable insights on how to optimize AI while avoiding common pitfalls.
3. **Transparency and accountability:** Companies must strive to make their AI algorithms as transparent as possible. This may involve documenting decision-making processes and establishing accountability mechanisms in case of errors or biases.
4. **Regular evaluation**: Like any technology, AI evolves rapidly. Companies must regularly evaluate their AI tools and methods to ensure they remain relevant and effective.
5. **Balanced decision-making:** Although AI can provide valuable recommendations, the final decision should always be made by humans. Boards of directors must strive to find a balance between data-based insights and human judgment.
6. **Ethical considerations:** Beyond mere efficiency, companies must consider the ethical implications of their AI-based decisions. This may involve consulting with ethics experts or establishing dedicated ethics committees.[2]

Furthermore, AI can promote diversity within governing bodies. By eliminating unconscious biases from the recruitment process, for example, AI systems evaluate candidates solely based on their skills and experience, thus promoting diversity by avoiding discrimination. This diversification is crucial for more balanced decisions and a broader representation of perspectives within governing bodies. Transparency is another key area where AI plays a major role. AI algorithms can monitor financial operations and detect fraudulent or non-compliant behavior.

This continuous monitoring ensures that governing bodies comply with current rules and regulations, thus enhancing the trust of shareholders, investors, and the public. Artificial intelligence is fundamentally reshaping corporate governance, offering advantages in terms of decision-making, diversity, transparency, but also challenges in terms of legal responsibility, ethics, and data management. Companies and governing bodies must adapt to this new reality by developing appropriate policies and regulations to make the most of AI while maintaining high ethical and legal standards.

AI holds immense potential for improving decision-making within corporate boards. However, to fully realize this potential, companies must adopt a thoughtful approach centered on ethics and collaboration. It has the capability to analyze vast quantities of data in record time, thereby enabling companies to make more informed decisions. This transformation in decision-making processes can impact corporate governance in several ways.

Firstly, AI systems enable a thorough analysis of data, highlighting trends and opportunities that governing bodies might not otherwise access. For example, AI can analyze customer purchasing habits, market preferences, and economic factors in real time, allowing businesses to adapt swiftly.

Secondly, AI can aid governing bodies in managing risks more effectively. AI models can predict financial risks, identify potential compliance issues, and detect frauds. This enhances stability and accountability in corporate governance.

Thirdly, automating administrative tasks through AI frees up time for governing bodies. This allows them to focus on crucial strategic decisions for the business, while reducing potential human errors.[3]

AI can also enhance transparency in corporate governance. AI algorithms can monitor financial operations and detect fraudulent or non-compliant behaviors. This ensures that governing bodies adhere to current rules and regulations.

For example, AI systems can analyze financial transactions in real-time to detect suspicious activities, allowing for immediate preventative actions. Moreover, AI can automate financial reporting, ensuring accurate and timely disclosure of information to shareholders and regulators.

While its application has undeniable appeals, adopting AI also raises challenges. These challenges include the necessity of programming systems with values aligned with those of the designers, cognitive biases, errors, and subjectivity that can affect the decision-making process. [4]Additionally, the effective and ethical integration of AI into business operations may require changes in data management and raise concerns regarding privacy and trust.[5]

- **Ethical questions**

The use of AI raises moral questions regarding privacy protection, combating discrimination, transparency, accountability, and impartiality. Establishing clear rules, charters, and legislation becomes imperative to encourage a reasoned implementation of AI.

- **Data quality and management**

An essential factor in the efficient functioning of AI is the impeccable quality of the collected data. Poor data quality can lead to erroneous results or misguided choices, thus undermining trust in AI systems. Concurrently, managing large volumes of information requires strict cybersecurity protocols to protect confidential data against potential breaches.

- **Integration into current infrastructures:**

Inserting AI into existing architectures can represent a complex and costly challenge. This maneuver demands meticulous planning, exhaustive testing, and gradual implementation to minimize disruptions and maximize harmony with existing systems.

In summary, while AI offers significant advantages in terms of efficiency, productivity, and enhanced decision-making in the administrative decision-making process[6], it also poses challenges related to ethics, transparency, and over-reliance. Finding a balance between these benefits and challenges is essential for the successful integration of AI into the administrative realm.

B. Exploration of potential risks such as algorithmic biases and the loss of human control

The potential risks associated with the use of AI include algorithmic biases and the loss of human control. Algorithmic biases occur when algorithms are influenced by prejudices, leading to unfair decisions. A concrete example would be the use of recruitment algorithms that favor candidates similar to current employees, thereby excluding candidates from minority groups.[7]

The globalization of ethical reference strengthens this trend. A doctrinal consensus highlights the need to frame algorithms not by law but by ethical values. In this strategy regarding AI, there's an emphasized need for a reflection on the regulation and ethics of AI. [8]Here, ethics do not refer to the common or Aristotelian sense of moral philosophy but to "values" that prefigure the legal norm, serving as a precursor to the law and leading to common values at the international level, detached from limited territorial legal systems.

This thoughtful approach is particularly discernible in the European Union (EU) initiatives aimed at substantially framing artificial intelligence (AI). The European strategy on AI, centered on the "human factor," is structured around three major objectives. First, it seeks to enhance the EU's technological and industrial capacity across all sectors of the economy. Second, it aims to address socio-economic changes. Finally, its third objective is to ensure the existence of an appropriate ethical and legal framework.

Regarding this crucial last point, an expert group on ethics in the field of connected and automated driving was established. Facing the need to develop ethical guidelines, the Commission set up a high-level expert group on AI[9], supported by the European AI Alliance, a collaborative platform designed to gather contributions from other stakeholders. In March 2019, the expert group published a set of guidelines, which the Commission endorsed. Although not binding, the Commission advocates their implementation and, in a pilot phase, plans to test, practice, and adjust them after receiving feedback in early 2020.

The EU's two fundamental objectives are clear: adopting an ethical approach toward AI to strengthen citizens' trust in digital development and creating a competitive advantage for European businesses in AI. To achieve this, the Commission proposes to integrate into AI development "the values upon which our societies are built." These "values" include legal rules, the values of the Union shared by its Member States, such as respect for human dignity, freedom, democracy,

equality, the rule of law, and respect for human rights. However, the Commission clearly states that these values go beyond the scope of law, requiring that AI applications be "not only compliant with legislation but also respect ethical principles" that clearly transcend positive law.

To minimize these risks, the implementation of effective human controls is crucial. This includes error and discrimination detection, preserving procedural values, and the duty of diligence to demonstrate compliance[10]. It is also crucial to align algorithmic decisions with ethical and legal values, acknowledging that human expertise remains indispensable in complex contexts.[11]

The globalization of AI regulation emerges as a response to this globalized technology[12]. It manifests on two levels:[13] first, at the global level, where the consensus on the extent of regulation leads to a globalization of the AI regulation field. Discussions also converge towards an original model of regulation, referring to common instruments. Éric Millard[14], in his analysis, defines globalization as "the emergence of cultural, economic, political, and normative processes surpassing the territorial scope of nation-states, capable of being put in competition in action." Thus, the globalization of AI regulation instruments becomes an inevitable phenomenon in a globalized context, where technological challenges are identical across all regions of the world.

The loss of human control materializes when decisions are fully automated, depriving humans of the ability to oversee or understand the outcomes generated by algorithms. This situation can lead to errors or inappropriate decisions, as algorithms lack the conceptual understanding and common sense inherent to humans. [15]

Recognizing the importance of human oversight in decision-making processes is crucial. Decision-makers must be aware of the danger of entrusting their responsibilities to machines. This approach ensures a more balanced and situationally appropriate perspective because it integrates human sensitivity, experience, and reliability into the decision-making process. By leaving control in human hands rather than machines, we ensure that decisions are guided by a deep understanding of the nuances and specific needs of each collaborator and situation, thus contributing to fairer and more humane outcomes.[16]

The use of AI tools has become indispensable; this solution is distinguished by its usage transparency, providing a detailed explanation of predictive and analytical mechanisms. Furthermore, it ensures a reliable algorithmic interpretation, guaranteeing unbiased results and thus promoting informed decision-making.

Although artificial intelligence may allow for more impartial outcomes, some stakeholders go further in their opinion. They argue that not everything said about AI should be accepted uncritically, but caution is needed because AI is programmed by humans, and therefore methodological and ethical choices must be made. AI remains neutral if the input data are neutral. However, if the base data are biased, the result will be too.

The principle of human primacy in artificial intelligence (AI) emphasizes that AI systems should serve humans and be controlled by them. It implies that everyone can benefit from AI and that its deployment aims to assist those most distant from digital access. This principle demands a human benefit, human supervision of the system, management of human dependence on AI, and treating system malfunctions as human errors. It highlights the responsibility of individuals controlling AI systems in case of damage.

The use of AI systems must be guided by the public interest and respect fundamental rights, without categorically banning certain uses. Administrations must ensure AI's accessibility to all and minimize infringements on rights and freedoms. Finally, it is crucial to analyze the long-term consequences of AI on society to prevent citizens from being dispossessed of their capacity to act and to promote a shared digital culture.[17]

Part II: Legal principles and procedural safeguards to frame the use of artificial intelligence in administrative decision-making

Legal principles and procedural safeguards to frame the use of artificial intelligence (AI) in administrative decision-making play a crucial role in preventing abuses, ensuring fairness, and protecting individuals' rights. These principles include human primacy, which underscores that AI systems must operate for the benefit of humans and that humans are responsible for the consequences of malfunctions.[18]

Moreover, the principle of human benefit requires that the administration demonstrate that the use of AI aims to bring an advantage to the human community, while respecting fundamental rights. It is crucial that automation decisions are guided by general interest purposes and that any interference in individual rights is proportional to the expected benefits. It is also highlighted that specific prohibitions on AI systems should be approached with caution to avoid demonizing these technologies and preserve technological neutrality.[19] The responsibility of individuals controlling AI systems in the event of damage is also emphasized, highlighting the need to monitor and supervise these technologies to ensure their ethical and equitable use.

A. Relevant legal principles for administrative decision-making

When framing the use of artificial intelligence (AI) in administrative decision-making, several relevant legal principles can be applied. Here are some of these principles:[20]

- **Principle of legality:** The use of AI in administrative decision-making must comply with current laws and regulations. Decisions made by AI must respect legal standards and be in accordance with the rights and obligations of the individuals concerned.
- **Principle of non-discrimination:** AI must be used in a way that avoids any form of discrimination. Algorithms must be designed to ensure equal opportunities and to prevent discriminatory biases, avoiding decisions based on protected characteristics such as ethnic origin, gender, religion, or other similar criteria.
- **Principle of transparency:** Decisions made by AI must be transparent. The individuals concerned must be informed that decisions are made by AI, understand the criteria and processes used, and have access to relevant information on which decisions are based. Transparency makes AI decisions more understandable and contestable.
- **Principle of explicability**: AI used in administrative decision-making must be able to explain the reasons behind its decisions. The individuals concerned must be able to understand why a decision was made by AI and have access to clear and comprehensible explanations. Explicability is essential for ensuring accountability and allowing individuals to contest decisions if necessary.
- **Principle of protection of fundamental rights:** The use of AI must not infringe upon individuals' fundamental rights. This includes respect for privacy, protection of personal data, and respect for individual freedoms. AI must not be used in a way that violates these rights and must be subjected to adequate protection mechanisms.
- **Principle of responsibility**: Responsibilities related to the use of AI in administrative decision-making must be clearly defined. It must be established who is responsible for decisions made by AI, how errors or potential damages will be addressed, and how accountability mechanisms will be implemented.[21]

These legal principles provide a framework for framing the use of AI in administrative decision-making, ensuring that decisions are legal, non-discriminatory, transparent, explicable, respectful of fundamental rights, and that responsibilities are clearly established. By adhering to these principles, it is possible to reconcile the efficiency of AI with fundamental legal principles.

AI systems require a significant amount of data from various sources, including personal data. Regulating access, sensitivity, integrity, secondary uses, valorization, and data quality is crucial to ensure a responsible and successful implementation of AI. The current legal framework must be reviewed to avoid any obstacles to AI innovation. The principle of human primacy underlines that AI systems should serve humans, be supervised by them, and that humans are responsible for malfunctions.

It's essential that AI benefits everyone, providing equitable digital access. This principle implies a requirement for human benefit, human supervision of the system, managing human dependency on the system, and accountability for system errors as human errors.[22]

B. Procedural safeguards to ensure a fair decision-making process

When it comes to framing the use of artificial intelligence (AI) in administrative decision-making, establishing procedural safeguards to ensure a fair decision-making process is important. Here are some of these safeguards:

- **Algorithm transparency:** The AI algorithm must be transparent and understandable. The individuals concerned should be informed about the criteria, data, and methods used by the AI to make decisions. Transparency allows individuals to understand how decisions are made and to detect potential biases or errors.[23]
- **Regular evaluation and validation**: The AI algorithm must be evaluated and validated regularly to ensure its efficiency, impartiality, and compliance with legal standards. Evaluations should be conducted by independent experts, and the results should be made public. AI supervision can be conditional, leaving the choice to the agent or imposing systematic validation of critical decisions. The principle of human primacy emphasizes that humans must ensure the proper functioning of AI systems and assume the consequences. AI systems must serve human action and benefit everyone, with shared responsibility between humans and competent agents.[24]
- **Ethical data collection and use**: The data used by AI must be collected and used ethically. This means the data must be relevant, accurate, non-discriminatory, and obtained in accordance with laws and individuals' rights. Individuals must be informed about the collection of their data and how it will be used.[25]
- **Right to explanation**: The individuals concerned must have the right to obtain an explanation about the decisions made by the AI. They should be able to understand the reasons and criteria on which the decisions are based. This allows individuals to contest decisions and request corrections if necessary.
- **Human supervision and control:** Decisions made by AI must be subject to human supervision and control. Human decision-makers should have the ability to review, interpret, and validate decisions made by AI. The presence of human intervention ensures ethical and fair decision-making.
- **Recourse and contestation mechanisms**: Individuals must have access to recourse and contestation mechanisms to challenge decisions made by AI. This can include appeal

procedures, review mechanisms, or the possibility of reevaluation by human experts. Recourse mechanisms allow for the verification of the legitimacy of decisions and remediation of potential errors.

Implementing these procedural safeguards can frame the use of AI in administrative decision-making in a way that ensures a fair, transparent, and rights-respecting decision-making process. These safeguards help to build trust in the use of AI and ensure that decisions made are fair and conform to legal principles.

In the United States, public authorities use blockchains to combat corruption and tax fraud, while in the United Kingdom, this technology is used to disburse social benefits. Blockchains are a priority in China, leading to the emergence of official, institutionalized blockchains. In France, however, public authorities are more concerned with artificial intelligence and algorithms. These allow the administration and the administered to save valuable resources through the automation of certain services, procedures, and steps.

The phenomenon of the algorithmization and automation of the State and administration can be a valuable aid in the era of modernization, rationalization, and dematerialization of public services. It constitutes both a qualitative and quantitative break in the technological modernization process of institutions. Artificial intelligence goes as far as to replace human decision-making with computerized decisions or, to a lesser extent, to put computerized decision-making at the service of human decision-making.

Thus, algorithmic propositions increasingly support human choice — but they also come to replace it. Algorithms gradually and quite insidiously become the new determinants, frameworks, and vectors of public policies and the law that accompanies them.

Conclusion:

As artificial intelligence (AI) plays an increasingly important role in public administration, it offers significant possibilities for enhancing the efficiency and quality of public services. AI's applications in this field are diverse, ranging from fraud detection to the optimization of administrative processes, resource planning, and enhancing transparency.

However, the use of AI in public administration is not without challenges. Ethical issues, such as algorithmic bias and data privacy, require constant attention to ensure fair decisions and protect citizens' privacy.

The rise of artificial intelligence (AI) in administrative decision-making necessitates a solid legal framework to ensure responsible use that complies with democratic standards. To adequately frame this use, it is essential to evaluate existing legal frameworks internationally.

Public trust is also crucial, which necessitates increased transparency in the use of AI and clear communication about its implications. Moreover, the successful implementation of AI in public administration requires significant investments in technology, training, and human resources. Developing the necessary skills among public servants and establishing appropriate governance frameworks to guide responsible AI use is essential.

Despite these challenges, the potential benefits of AI in public administration are undeniable. Automating tasks, enhancing decision-making, optimizing resources, and improving public services are aspects that can profoundly transform how public services are managed and offered to citizens.

To successfully adopt AI in public administration, it is necessary to establish appropriate policies and regulations to frame its use, while promoting collaboration among AI experts,

policymakers, and stakeholders. By combining AI technology with strong ethical principles and transparent governance, it is possible to maximize AI's benefits while minimizing the risks.

Several countries have already implemented specific regulations to frame the use of AI. It is important to analyze these legal frameworks to draw lessons and identify best practices. This will allow the development of a legal framework adapted to each national context while being in harmony with international standards.

In parallel, it is crucial to formulate key recommendations to ensure responsible, ethical, and democratically compliant use of AI in administrative decision-making. These recommendations may include:

- **Transparency and accountability**: Organizations and administrations using AI must be transparent about the criteria, methods, and data used in decision-making processes. They must also be accountable for their decisions and be able to provide clear explanations in case of disputes.
- **Bias assessment**: It is essential to ensure that AI systems do not replicate existing biases in data or decision-making processes. Regular evaluation mechanisms must be established to detect and correct potential biases.
- **Data protection and privacy**: The data used by AI must be collected and processed in accordance with data protection laws and respect for privacy. Individuals must be informed about the collection and use of their data, and their consent must be obtained when necessary.
- **Human supervision and control**: Decisions made by AI must be subject to human supervision and control. Human decision-makers must have the ability to review, interpret, and validate decisions made by AI to ensure their fairness and legitimacy.
- **Training and awareness**: It is important to train administrators and AI users about ethical issues and the implications of automated decisions. Increased awareness of these issues will contribute to a more responsible use of AI.

In summary, establishing a solid legal framework and clear recommendations is essential for the responsible use of AI in administrative decision-making. This will ensure that AI is used ethically, transparently, and in accordance with democratic standards while safeguarding the rights and interests of the individuals concerned.

[1]Prof. Dr. Johan Wolswinkel, "Artificial Intelligence and Administrative Law," Council of Europe Editions, Strasbourg, December 2022 , p.8,9.

[2]Frédéric Matthey, "Artificial Intelligence in Boards of Directors: A Silent Revolution," Economic World, 2023, p. 2.

[3]David Ybert de Fontenelle & Virginie Cadouin, "The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Corporate Governance and the Responsibility of Governing Bodies," BruzzoDubucq, 2023, p.3,4.

[4]Zyad Chouadhi, "Artificial Intelligence (AI) and the Governance of Organizations: Advantages, Challenges, and Perspectives," Scientific Review, Quebec, Canada, 2024, p.2.

[5]Eram Kanwar Khan, "The Challenges and Issues of Artificial Intelligence for Businesses," Digital Innovation, 2023, p 6,7.

[6]Morgane Soulier, "AI and Corporate Governance: Between Strategic Innovation and Ethical Challenges," Harvard Business Review, 2024, p 3,4.

[7]Report, "Algorithms: Bias Control, Please," Montaigne Institute, Paris, March 2020.

[8]W. Maxwell and D. Ouandji, "Appropriate Measures and Risk Analyses in the GDPR," The DPO Review, Retrospective 2018, University of Paris 1, March 2019, pp 17-30; EDPB, Guidelines 4/2019 on Article 25, Data Protection by Design and by Default, Version 2.0 Adopted on 20 October 2020.

[9]Commission, Communication from April 8, 2019, COM(2019) 168 final, "Fostering Trust in Human-Centric Artificial Intelligence."

[10]Clément Henin, Daniel Le Métayer, "Beyond Explainability: Justifiability and Contestability of Algorithmic Decision Systems," AI & SOCIETY, July 2021, https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-021-01251-8.

[11]Winston Maxwell, "Human Control of Algorithmic Systems – A Critical Look at the Requirement for a 'Human in the Loop'," Hal science, Law. University of Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne, 2022.

[12]Morgane Soulier, op. cit, p. 14.

[13]Arnaud Sée, "The Regulation of Algorithms: A New Model of Globalization?" Hal science, French Review of Administrative Law, 2019,2020, p.11,12,13.

[14]Éric Millard. "Accounting for Law in a Globalization Context." J.-Y. Chérot and B. Frydman. The Science of Law in Globalization, Bruylant, pp.49-62, 2012.

[15]Sonia Cabanis, "Artificial Intelligence: What Changes for Corporate Risk Profiles?" Deloitte, Paris, 2024, p 2.

[16]Santoni de Sio, F., and van den Hoven, J. "Meaningful Human Control Over Autonomous Systems: A Philosophical Account." Frontiers in Robotics, (2018), p 10,11.

[17]Hugo Baillet, "AI and Strategic Decision Making: A New Era for Leaders," Data Intelligence Review, France, 2023, p 3.

[18]Steve Jacob and Seima Souissi, "Artificial Intelligence in Public Administration in Quebec," Research Papers on Public Administration in the Digital Age, No 5, Quebec, 2022, p 31,32.

[19]Etscheid, J., "Artificial Intelligence in Public Administration: A Possible Framework for Partial and Full Automation." In Lindgren, International Conference, Italy, September 2-4, 2019.

[20]RARHOUI Kaoutar, "Artificial Intelligence Law and Public Administration," International Researcher Review, Mohammed V University of Rabat, 2023, p 362,363.

[21]Team Trust, Editorial Team, "Legal Issues of Artificial Intelligence," Paris, 2022? P3.

[22]"Strategy for the Integration of Artificial Intelligence in Public Administration 2021-2026: A Fundamental Action Based on Responsible Practices," Quebec, 2023, p 8, 9.

[23]Lucie Cluzel-Métayer, "Calculating: The Influence of Algorithms on the Issuance of Administrative Decisions," HAL science, 2021, p 12, 13.

[24]Sutcliffe, A., & Wang, Y. (2021). "Algorithmic Bias and Public Administration." In The Oxford Handbook of Ethics in AI (pp. 327-343). Oxford University Press.

[25]N. Fricero, "Algorithms and a New Generation of Human Rights. About the European Ethical Charter on the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Judicial Systems and Their Environment," JCP G, No. 51, 2018, p21.

Bibliography:

A- Books:

1. Prof. Dr. Johan Wolswinkel, "Artificial Intelligence and Administrative Law," 1st edition, Strasbourg; 2022.
2. Team Trust, Editorial Team, "Legal Issues of Artificial Intelligence," Paris; 2022.
3. "Strategy for the Integration of Artificial Intelligence in Public Administration 2021-2026: A Fundamental Action Based on Responsible Practices," Quebec; 2023.
4. Lucie Cluzel-Métayer, "Calculating: The Influence of Algorithms on the Issuance of Administrative Decisions," HAL science; 2021.
5. Sutcliffe, A., & Wang, Y., "Algorithmic Bias and Public Administration," The Oxford Handbook of Ethics in AI, Oxford University Press; 2021.
6. N. Fricero, "Algorithms and a New Generation of Human Rights. About the European Ethical Charter on the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Judicial Systems and Their Environment," JCP G, No. 51; 2018.
7. Arnaud Sée, "The Regulation of Algorithms: A New Model of Globalization?" Hal science, French Review of Administrative Law; 2019,2020.
8. Éric Millard, "Accounting for Law in a Globalization Context," J.-Y. Chérot and B. Frydman, The Science of Law in Globalization, Bruylant; 2012.
9. Sonia Cabanis, "Artificial Intelligence: What Changes for Corporate Risk Profiles?" Deloitte, Paris; 2024.
10. Santoni de Sio, F., and van den Hoven, J., "Meaningful Human Control Over Autonomous Systems: A Philosophical Account," Frontiers in Robotics; 2018.
11. Hugo Baillet, "AI and Strategic Decision Making: A New Era for Leaders," Data Intelligence Review, France; 2023.
12. Steve Jacob and Seima Souissi, "Artificial Intelligence in Public Administration in Quebec," Research Papers on Public Administration in the Digital Age, No 5, Quebec; 2022.

13. Frédéric Matthey, "Artificial Intelligence in Boards of Directors: A Silent Revolution," Economic World; 2023.
14. David Ybert de Fontenelle & Virginie Cadouin, "The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Corporate Governance and the Responsibility of Governing Bodies," BruzzoDubucq; 2023.

B - Journal articles:

1. Zyad Chouadhi, "Artificial Intelligence (AI) and the Governance of Organizations: Advantages, Challenges, and Perspectives," Scientific Review, Quebec, Canada,; 2024.
2. Eram Kanwar Khan, "The Challenges and Issues of Artificial Intelligence for Businesses," Digital Innovation; 2023.
3. Morgane Soulier, "AI and Corporate Governance: Between Strategic Innovation and Ethical Challenges," Harvard Business Review, 2024.
4. RARHOUI Kaoutar, "Artificial Intelligence Law and Public Administration," International Researcher Review, Mohammed V University of Rabat; 2023.

C- Seminar papers:

1. J. Etscheid, "Artificial Intelligence in Public Administration: A Possible Framework for Partial and Full Automation," International Conference, Italy, September 2-4, 2019; Italy; 2019.
2. Commission, "Fostering Trust in Human-Centric Artificial Intelligence," COM(2019) 168 final, Brussels; April 8, 2019.
3. Winston Maxwell, "Human Control of Algorithmic Systems – A Critical Look at the Requirement for a 'Human in the Loop'," Hal science, Law, University of Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne; 2022.
4. W. Maxwell and D. Ouandji, "Appropriate Measures and Risk Analyses in the GDPR," The DPO Review, Retrospective 2018, University of Paris 1; March 2019.

D - Websites:

1. Clément Henin, Daniel Le Métayer, "Beyond Explainability: Justifiability and Contestability of Algorithmic Decision Systems," AI & SOCIETY, website: https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-021-01251-8

E - Reports:

Report, "Algorithms: Bias Control, Please," Montaigne Institute, Paris; March