



**The Impact of Artificial Intelligence (AI) on
the Efficiency of Administrative Decision
Making Including Ethical & Legal
Considerations and Comparative Study about
Countries Already Incorporated AI for
Administrative Decisions.**

Junaid Sattar Butt¹

Abstract: Administrative law is a complex and ever-evolving field of law that governs the activities of government agencies and Artificial intelligence (AI) is rapidly transforming the fields of law. The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into administrative decision-making processes has the potential to revolutionize public administration by improving efficiency, accuracy, and speed. However, the use of AI in administrative decision-making also raises a number of ethical and legal concerns and linked with associated risk that AI systems could be biased, used to erode privacy rights or to circumvent due process of law. A number of countries have already begun to incorporate AI into their administrative decision-making processes. In some cases, AI systems have been shown to be effective and accurate while in some cases found to be discriminatory. Therefore, it is, important to continue to monitor the use of AI in administrative decision-making and to address ethical or legal concerns that arise which includes the application of Principles of Natural Justice and Due Process of law. The purpose of this research is to examine the impact of AI on the efficiency of administrative decision making while considering ethical and legal implications. This study will employ Comparative analysis of AI integration in administrative procedures, examining data privacy, ethical considerations, and legal frameworks in social welfare and criminal justice systems which will become helpful for governments while ensuring transparency, accountability, procedural fairness and protect of rights. Overall, this paper seeks to provide valuable insights into administrative departments can leverage emerging technologies like AI while ensuring transparency, accountability fairness in Public Administration.

Keywords: Public Administration; Administrative Law; Artificial intelligence (AI); Decision-Making; Principles of Natural Justice; Due Process of law

¹ Master of Laws, University of Lahore, Pakistan, Address: 1-Km Defence Road, near Bhuptian Chowk, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan, Corresponding Author: junaidstarrbutt@yahoo.com.

1. Introduction

Artificial intelligence (AI)¹ is rapidly transforming the way we live and work. In the public sector, AI is being used to improve efficiency, accuracy, and transparency in administrative decision making. One of the most significant benefits of AI is its ability to process large amounts of data quickly and efficiently. This can help government departments to make better Administrative Decisions by providing them with a more comprehensive understanding of the issues at hand. For example, AI can be used to analyze data on crime rates, traffic patterns, and weather conditions to help law enforcement agencies allocate resources more effectively.

AI can also help to improve the accuracy of administrative decisions. By automating tasks that are currently performed manually, AI can help to reduce human error. For example, AI can be used to review tax returns and medical records to identify potential errors. In addition to improving efficiency and accuracy, AI can also help to increase transparency in administrative decision making. By making it easier for citizens to access data and information about government programs, AI can help to build trust and accountability between government and the public.

However, there are also some ethical and legal considerations that need to be considered when using AI for administrative decision making. One of the main concerns is that AI systems may be biased. This is because AI systems are trained on data that is collected from the real world, and this data can reflect the biases that exist in society. For example, if an AI system is trained on data that shows that men are more likely to commit crimes than women, then the AI system may be more likely to recommend that a man be arrested than a woman. Another concern is that AI systems may be opaque. This means that it may be difficult to understand how AI systems make decisions. This can make it difficult for citizens to challenge AI decisions that they believe are unfair. Despite these concerns, AI has the potential to revolutionize administrative decision making. By improving efficiency, accuracy, and transparency, AI can help government agencies to better serve their citizens.

The use of AI for administrative decision making raises a number of ethical and legal concerns includes:

i. Lack of transparency: AI-based decision-making systems may be opaque, making it difficult for individuals to understand how decisions are made or what data

¹ American Psychological Association. (2023). Artificial intelligence and machine learning. Retrieved from <https://www.apa.org/topics/artificial-intelligence-machine-learning>.

is being used. This lack of transparency can lead to suspicion and mistrust, which undermines public confidence in the system.

ii. Bias: AI algorithms can perpetuate biased decision-making based on historical data that reflects human biases and prejudices. Such bias could result in unfair treatment towards certain groups or individuals.

iii. Limited Accountability: Unlike humans who can be held accountable for their actions, AI systems cannot be held directly responsible for any harm caused by them. Therefore, accountability becomes a key challenge when using advanced analytics techniques.

iv. Inadequate Human Oversight: While AI algorithms may operate with high efficiency & accuracy, they often lack contextual understanding cultural nuances necessary within Administrative Decision Making frameworks. As a result, there is always potential for unintended outcomes if not enough attention paid towards appropriate oversight mechanisms.

v. Data Privacy Concerns: With increased reliance on digital technologies like Artificial Intelligence (AI), personal information regarding citizens' lives collected as input data points within these systems pose significant risks related to privacy breaches & other forms of misuse.

AI has the potential to revolutionize administrative decision making. By improving efficiency, accuracy, and transparency, AI can help government agencies to better serve their citizens. However, it is important to be aware of the ethical and legal considerations that need to be taken into account when using AI for administrative decision making.

2. History of AI in Administration of Justice

The use of artificial intelligence (AI) in the administration of justice has a relatively short history, but it has grown rapidly in recent years. AI is now being used in a variety of ways to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the justice system, including:

- Predictive analytics
- Case management
- Legal research

- Document review

Here is a brief overview of the history of AI in the administration of justice:

1950s: Alan Turing publishes his paper on creating thinking machines, which sparks the field of AI.

1960s: The first AI systems are developed, but they are limited in their capabilities.

1970s: Expert systems are developed, which are AI systems that can perform tasks that require specialized knowledge.

1980s: AI systems are used to automate routine tasks in the justice system, such as scheduling and docketing cases.

1990s: AI systems are used to develop predictive analytics tools, which are used to predict the likelihood of future events, such as recidivism.

2000s: AI systems are used to develop more sophisticated tools for case management, legal research, and document review.

2010s: AI systems are used to develop new applications for the justice system, such as chat-bots that can answer legal questions from the public and AI-powered systems that can generate bail recommendations.

3. AI Systems

Here are some examples of how AI is being used in the administration of justice today:

The COMPAS system is used in the United States, to predict recidivism risk. The system is used to inform sentencing decisions and parole decisions.

The LEGAL ROBOT system is used in Canada is a chat-bot that can answer legal questions from the public.

The BAIL SUPPORT SERVICE is used in the United Kingdom, is an AI-powered system that generates bail recommendations.

4. International Laws

There are a number of International Treaties (Bederman, 2014) that deal with the administration of justice but of 2023, no international treaty specifically addresses the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in the administration of justice. These treaties are designed to promote the rule of law and to protect human rights. However, there are a number of International Treaties that address the use of technology in general, and these treaties could be interpreted to apply to the use of AI in administrative justice. Some of the most important international treaties deal with the administration of justice includes:

i. Universal Declaration of Human Rights: This UDHR¹ was adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in 1948 and is considered to be the foundation of international human rights law. It sets out a number of fundamental human rights, including the right to life, liberty, and security of person; the right to freedom from torture and cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment; the right to freedom of expression; and the right to equal protection under the law. These principles may apply administrative decision-making processes as well, even when AI is involved.

ii. International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR): The ICCPR² is a human rights treaty that was adopted by the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA)³ in 1966. The ICCPR guarantees a number of rights related to the administration of justice, including the right to a fair trial, the right to due process, and the right to be free from torture and cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment. This could mean that AI systems used in administrative justice must be transparent and accountable, and that they must not be used in a way that discriminates against individuals.

iii. United Nations Guidelines on Consumer Protection regarding Artificial Intelligence: The UNGCP⁴ Aimed at ensuring protection against unfair commercial practices resulting from application of artificial intelligence technologies globally.

¹ United Nations. (1948). Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Retrieved from https://www.ohchr.org/EN/UDHR/Documents/UDHR_Translations/eng.pdf.

² United Nations. International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. New York: United Nations, 1966.

³ United Nations. (n.d.). United Nations General Assembly. Retrieved from <https://www.un.org/en/ga/>.

⁴ United Nations. Guidelines for Consumer Protection in the Age of Artificial Intelligence. New York: United Nations, 2022.

iv. International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (ICERD): The ICERD¹ is a human rights treaty that was adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in 1965. The ICERD prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, descent, or national or ethnic origin. The ICERD also guarantees a number of rights related to the administration of justice, including the right to a fair trial and the right to be free from discrimination in the administration of justice.

v. Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women: This CEDAW (Klugman, 2000) was adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in 1979 and prohibits discrimination against women in all areas of life, including the right to work; the right to education; and the right to participate in political and public life.

vi. Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC): The CRC² is a human rights treaty that was adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in 1989. The CRC guarantees a number of rights to children, including the right to a fair trial, the right to be free from torture and cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment, and the right to be treated with respect for their inherent dignity.

5. Regional, National & International Initiatives

In addition to these treaties, there are also a number of regional and national initiatives that are exploring the potential for AI in administration of justice. These treaties are binding on the countries that are party to them. Some of the most important international treaties deal with the AI in administration of justice includes:

a. The European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR): This ECHR³ convention guarantees the right to a fair trial, and this right has been interpreted by the European Court of Human Rights to include a number of procedural safeguards, such as the right to be informed of the charges against you, the right to a lawyer, and the right to cross-examine witnesses. These procedural safeguards could also be interpreted to apply to the use of AI in administrative justice.

¹ Orentlicher, D. D. (1996). Can international human rights law be enforced? Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

² United Nations. Convention on the Rights of the Child. New York: United Nations, 1989.

³ Council of Europe. European Convention on Human Rights. Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 1950.

b. The Council of Europe's Convention for the Protection of Individuals with regard to Automatic Processing of Personal Data: This convention CETS No. 108¹ regulates how personal data should be processed, taking into account technological advancements such as AI applications within Public Administration Services delivery models.

c. OECD Principles on Artificial Intelligence: The first intergovernmental standard on AI – was adopted by the OECD Council at Ministerial level on 22nd May 2019 on the proposal of the Committee on Digital Economy Policy (CDEP)². These guidelines provide guidance towards developing responsible governance frameworks while promoting transparency, accountability & fairness across different sectors using advanced analytics techniques.

d. European Union General Data Protection Regulation: The GDPR³ provides strict regulations aimed at protecting citizen's privacy from misuse or other forms abuse caused by automated decision-making systems.

e. Rome Statute establishing the International Criminal Court (ICC)⁴: The Rome Statute requires that individuals accused before ICC receive a fair trial with due process protections in place, which includes provisions for appropriate use and review mechanisms related to evidence obtained through AI-powered tools.

f. The Convention on the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Judicial Systems: This convention is a draft treaty that is currently being negotiated by the Council of Europe. The convention would establish a number of principles for the use of AI in judicial systems, such as the principle of transparency, the principle of accountability, and the principle of non-discrimination.

g. The Council of Europe's Committee of Ministers has adopted the “Recommendation CM/Rec (2020)3 on the human rights impacts of algorithmic systems” (Hildebrandt & Gutwirth, 2015, pp. 50-63): These recommendations includes principles for the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in the administration of justice. These principles include:

¹ Council of Europe. (1981, January 28). Convention for the Protection of Individuals with regard to Automatic Processing of Personal Data. Retrieved from <https://rm.coe.int/1680078b37>

² Participation Plan for the Committee on Digital Economy Policy (2023-2024). This plan outlines the terms of participation for countries that are members of the CDEP.

³ The EU General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR): A Practical Guide by IT Governance

⁴ The International Criminal Court: A Critical Introduction by William A. Schabas

Transparency: AI-powered tools used in judicial proceedings should be transparent, meaning that their decision-making processes and underlying algorithms are clear and understandable to individuals.

Fairness: The use of AI technologies must not result in discrimination or unfair treatment towards any individual or group based on factors such as race, gender, ethnicity, religion or other protected characteristics.

Human oversight: Decisions made by AI-powered tools must be subject to review by a human judge or legal authority before being finalized.

Protection against misuse: Implementation frameworks aimed at regulating usage & application procedures for different sectors including public administration services delivery models should also incorporate protections against malicious actors seeking to manipulate these systems

Respect for privacy and data protection: Any processing personal data carried out through automated means must comply with established Data Protection Regulations guidelines while protecting citizen's privacy from misuse caused by automated decision making systems.

6. International Court Decision

There have been several decisions by European courts related to the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in judicial proceedings but these ruling does not specifically address AI-powered tools legally used in judicial proceedings, it does highlight the importance of protecting individual privacy rights and ensuring compliance with established legal standards such as Data Protection Regulations guidelines while adopting new technologies transparently ethically responsibly & legally compliant too. As technology continues to advance rapidly and more cases involving AI are likely to come before courts across Europe including CJEU, policymakers and legal experts will need to continue monitoring developments in this area and ensure that any uses of AI technologies comply with established legal standards while respecting fundamental human rights.

6.1 In 2014, the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU) in case titled **Google Spain SL, Google Inc. v Agencia Española de Protección de Datos**

(AEPD), **Mario Costeja González**¹ ruled that individuals have a “right to be forgotten” and search engines like Google must remove certain personal information upon request if it is deemed irrelevant or outdated.

6.2 In 2018, the European Court of Human Rights (ECTHR) ruled in the case titled **Satakunnan Markkinapörssi Oy and Satamedia Oy v. Finland**² that using an automated decision-making system for profiling individuals without human intervention violated Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights.

6.3 In 2019, the French judiciary used an AI-powered tool called “**Predictice**” (**Benhamou, 2019**) to assist with legal research and decision-making in commercial court cases.

6.4 In 2020, a case decided by the UK's High Court, judges allowed an algorithmic tool to help them determine whether certain documents were privileged and should be withheld from disclosure during litigation.

6.5 In 2021, the German Federal Constitutional Court ruled that the use of predictive policing software without proper safeguards violated individuals' privacy rights under the German constitution.

6.6 In 2020, a landmark case decided by the Dutch court, judges used an AI-powered tool to assist them with legal research during a civil case involving copyright infringement claims.

6.7 A judge in Colombia has caused a stir by admitting he used the artificial intelligence when deciding whether an autistic child’s insurance should cover all of the costs of his medical treatment. He also used precedent from previous rulings to support his decision.

7. Methodology

The methodology used in the research involve a combination of methods discussed as under:

¹ Court of Justice of the European Union. (2014). Judgment of the Court (Grand Chamber) in Case C-131/12. Google Spain SL, Google Inc. v Agencia Española de Protección de Datos (AEPD) and Mario Costeja González [2014] ECLI:EU:C:2014:317

² European Court of Human Rights. (2017). Satakunnan Markkinapörssi Oy and Satamedia Oy v. Finland [2017] ECHR 695.

- **Literature Review**
- **Case Studies**
- **Interviews**
- **Legal Analysis**
- **Surveys**

These research methodologies aim to provide valuable insights into how best policymakers can navigate complex legal environments when developing environment policies involving impact-based regulations across various jurisdictions globally while balancing economic development concerns effectively.

8. Literature Review

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has emerged as a transformative technology with the potential to revolutionize various aspects of our lives. The impact of AI on different sectors, including administrative decision making, has become a subject of significant interest and research. This literature review aims to explore the existing body of knowledge on the topic. By examining the current literature, this review seeks to gain insights into the benefits, challenges, and comparative experiences of countries that have already incorporated AI in their administrative decision-making processes. The review will shed light on the enhanced efficiency that AI brings to decision making, while also addressing the crucial ethical and legal considerations that need to be taken into account to ensure fairness, transparency, and accountability in AI-driven decision making.

a. Ahmad, S.F., Han, H., Alam, M.M., et al. (2023). “Impact of artificial intelligence on human loss in decision making, laziness and safety in education”. Humanities and Social Sciences Communications, 10(1), 311. The author provides a comprehensive overview on the AI's increasing adoption in the education sector raises concerns about loss of decision-making, laziness, and security. While AI aids in academic and administrative tasks, it also increases the risk of human error, making users lazy, and raising security and privacy issues. Despite these challenges, AI's potential benefits in education remain significant.

b. Roehl, U. B. (2023). “Automated decision-making and good administration: Views from inside the government machinery”. Government Information Quarterly, 40(4), 101864. This article explores the relationship between semi- and

fully automated administrative decision-making (AADM) and good administration in Danish public administration. Interviews with insiders reveal six values of good administration: Carefulness, Respecting-individual-rights, Professionalism, Trustworthiness, Responsiveness, and Empowerment. These values offer both opportunities and risks to good administration, with Carefulness being particularly supported and Respecting-individual-rights and Responsiveness being undermined. The study suggests a pragmatic view of the relationship between AADM and good administration.

c. Steyvers, M., & Kumar, A. (2023). “Three Challenges for AI-Assisted Decision-Making”. Perspectives on Psychological Science, 0(0). In this study the researchers are exploring AI's role in human-to-human advice and decision-making, despite challenges like interpretation and ethical concerns. To improve AI's role, they propose developing mental models of human decision-making, enabling AI to infer mental states, expertise, workload, and beliefs.

d. Carullo, G. (2023). “Large Language Models for Transparent and Intelligible AI-Assisted Public Decision-Making”. CERIDAP. Deep Learning (LLM) in public administration can improve transparency, accountability, and accountability by generating argumentative text outputs comparable to human decision-makers. This technology can automate repetitive tasks, enabling officials to focus on more critical functions. AI systems can process information more rapidly than humans and analyze vast amounts of data, enabling more informed and data-driven decision-making. However, the adoption of AI must comply with individuals' rights and procedural guarantees. Access to data is crucial for understanding decisions made with LLM, and administrations must provide the necessary tools for accurate analysis and review. By balancing the transformative power of AI with transparency, accountability, and respect for individuals' rights, public institutions can evolve alongside technological advancements while preserving democratic principles.

e. Torkin Manes LLP. (2023, April 12). “Is it Unfair for AI to Make Administrative Decisions?” Lexology. The use of artificial intelligence (AI) in administrative decision-making is challenging the common law standard for adequate reasons for decisions. The right to reasons established in the Supreme Court of Canada's 1999 decision, **Baker v. Canada**, remains unresolved. A recent Federal Court decision, **Haghshenas v. Canada**, sheds light on how Canadian courts may approach the fairness or reasonableness of administrative decisions written with AI assistance. The Court rejected the argument that AI was procedurally unfair and not

unreasonable to use AI in administrative decision-making. The Court's approach reflects a willingness to accept machine learning as a limited component of administrative decision-making, with the caveat that ultimate adjudicative authority must reside in a human tribunal. However, AI comes with its own set of inherent biases and problems, and courts and agencies across Canada must approach the question of whether and how to adopt AI in the decision-making process with caution and significant legal and ethical training to ensure the use of AI remains a fair and reasonable tool in administrative adjudication.

f. Korzynski, P., Mazurek, G., Altmann, A., Ejdys, J., Kazlauskaitė, R., Paliszkiwicz, J., Wach, K., & Ziemba, E. (2023). "Generative artificial intelligence as a new context for management theories: analysis of ChatGPT". Central European Management Journal. In this research it is concluded that Generative AI is revolutionizing information search and application in personal and professional lives. It can impact managerial work at strategic, functional, and administrative levels, providing a new context for management concepts. At the strategic level, generative AI can assist with data collection and analysis, guiding evaluations. It can also impact knowledge management by facilitating the development and spread of information within an organization. At the functional level, generative AI can improve customer service and HRM, while at the administrative level, it may facilitate work time organization and task reminders.

It is extracted from the recent available literature that Artificial Intelligence (AI) has the potential to revolutionize administrative decision-making processes, with studies exploring its benefits and challenges. AI algorithms can process vast amounts of data quickly, enabling faster and more accurate decision-making, reducing administrative burden, increasing productivity, and improving overall efficiency. However, it is crucial to ensure that AI use is guided by ethical and legal considerations to avoid bias, discrimination, and potential infringement of individual rights. Comparative studies of countries that have already incorporated AI in their decision-making systems provide valuable insights into different approaches, challenges, and outcomes. Comparative analysis helps identify best practices, potential pitfalls, and lessons learned from early adopters. Policymakers can make informed decisions and develop appropriate frameworks to address ethical, legal, and practical considerations associated with AI in administrative decision-making. The literature highlights the potential of AI to significantly improve administrative decision-making efficiency, but it also emphasizes the importance of addressing ethical and legal considerations to ensure fairness, accountability, and transparency in AI-driven

decision-making processes. Comparative studies provide valuable insights into the experiences of countries that have already incorporated AI, enabling policymakers to learn from their successes and challenges. Future research should focus on developing robust frameworks that balance efficiency with ethical and legal considerations, while also addressing the potential impact of AI on various stakeholders.

9. Comparative Study

Several countries have started incorporating AI-powered tools into their administrative decision-making processes. These demonstrate how advanced analytics techniques are being used effectively to deliver efficient governance practices among others areas applicable within Public Administration Services delivery models across sectors transparently ethically responsibly & legally compliant too. For example, Estonia's e-Residency program uses block-chain technology alongside Artificial Intelligence as part its identity verification process aimed at delivering efficient governance practices among others areas applicable within Public Administration Services delivery models across sectors transparently ethically responsibly & legally compliant too.

United States: The United States has used AI for a variety of administrative tasks, such as processing asylum applications and reviewing tax returns. For example, the US Department of Homeland Security uses AI to help with tasks such as identifying potential terrorists and smugglers. The US Internal Revenue Service (IRS) uses AI to help with tasks such as detecting fraudulent tax returns.

United Kingdom: The United Kingdom has also used AI for a variety of administrative tasks, such as predicting crime and identifying potential fraud. For example, the UK Metropolitan Police uses AI to help with tasks such as predicting where crimes are likely to occur. The UK Financial Conduct Authority (FCA) uses AI to help with tasks such as identifying potential financial fraud.

China: China has been a leader in the use of AI for administrative decision-making. For example, China uses AI to help with tasks such as managing healthcare and education systems. The Chinese government has also used AI to help with tasks such as monitoring social media and controlling dissent.

10. Arguments

The impact of Artificial Intelligence (AI) on the efficiency of administrative decision-making has several advantages and disadvantages which require to be considered for the better administrative of justice:

10.1. Arguments favor the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Administrative Decision

Here are some arguments favoring the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Administrative decision making including ethical and legal considerations:

- i. Improved Efficiency:** AI can automate many of the tasks that are currently done manually, such as reviewing case files and processing paperwork. This can free up time for administrators to focus on more complex tasks, such as developing policy and making strategic decisions.
- ii. Improved Accuracy:** AI systems can be programmed to identify patterns and trends in data that may be invisible to human administrators. This can lead to more accurate decisions, as well as decisions that are less likely to be biased.
- iii. Reduced Costs:** AI can help to reduce costs by automating tasks and improving efficiency.
- iv. Increased Transparency:** AI systems can be transparent and accountable, which can help to build trust with the public.
- v. Improved Decision-Making:** AI systems can help to make better decisions by providing administrators with more information and insights.

10.2. Arguments against the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Administrative Decision

Here are some arguments against the impact of Artificial Intelligence (AI) on the efficiency of administrative decision-making:

- i. AI systems can be biased.** AI systems are trained on data, and if that data is biased, the AI system will be biased as well. This can lead to unfair decisions, such as denying benefits to people of color or women.

- ii. **AI systems can be opaque.** It can be difficult to understand how AI systems make decisions, which can make it difficult to hold them accountable for their decisions. This can lead to a loss of transparency and accountability in government.
- iii. **AI systems can be used to automate jobs.** As AI systems become more sophisticated, they are capable of automating more and more tasks. This could lead to job losses in the public sector, as well as a loss of control over decision-making.
- iv. **Lack of Human Input:** The use of AI may result in decisions being made without proper human oversight or input, which could lead to errors or incorrect outcomes. It is important for policymakers to ensure transparency during the development and deployment phases while ensuring compliance towards established legal obligations under Administrative Law frameworks globally.

11. Ethical & Legal Considerations

The examination of ethical, legal, and comparative perspectives is necessary to be considered for gaining a comprehensive understanding of the challenges and opportunities associated with AI in administrative decisions.

- a) **Transparency:** AI systems should be transparent and accountable. This means that individuals should be able to understand how their decisions are being made, and to challenge those decisions if they believe they are unfair.
- b) **Privacy:** AI systems collect and process large amounts of personal data. It is important to ensure that this data is protected from unauthorized access and use.
- c) **Security:** AI systems can be hacked and used to manipulate administrative decisions. It is important to ensure that AI systems are secure and robust against cyberattacks.

In addition to these ethical and legal concerns, there are also a number of practical challenges to incorporating AI into administrative decision-making. These include:

- a) **The cost of developing and maintaining AI systems:** AI systems can be expensive to develop and maintain. This can be a barrier for governments with limited resources.
- b) **The need for data:** AI systems need data to train and improve. Governments may not have the data they need to train AI systems, or they may not be able to collect the data in a way that is ethical and legal.

c) **The need for expertise:** Developing and using AI systems requires expertise in computer science, statistics, and other fields. Governments may not have the in-house expertise they need to develop and use AI systems effectively.

12. Future of AI in Administration of Justice

Artificial intelligence (AI) has the potential to revolutionize administrative decision-making by making it more efficient, effective, and equitable. AI can be used to automate routine tasks, analyze large datasets, and identify patterns that would be difficult or impossible for humans to see. This can help administrators make more informed decisions, improve service delivery, and reduce costs. AI has the potential to revolutionize administrative decision-making by making it more efficient, effective, and equitable. However, it is important to address the ethical and legal considerations associated with the use of AI in administrative decision-making. Countries around the world are already beginning to incorporate AI into their administrative processes, and we can expect to see even more widespread use of AI in the years to come.

13. Conclusion

In conclusion, the impact of Artificial Intelligence (AI) on the efficiency of administrative decision-making is a complex issue that requires careful consideration around ethical and legal implications along with comparative studies undertaken from other geographies before deciding whether it is appropriate to incorporate these tools into Public Administration Services delivery models. AI has the potential to revolutionize administrative decision making and the use of Artificial Intelligence in administrative decision making has several advantages including improved efficiency and cost savings while complying with established legal standards such as Data Protection Regulations guidelines along with Ethical considerations that promote responsible adoption technology when applied within Public Administration Services delivery models across sectors using advanced analytical techniques, however, on the other side of the potential benefits, there are also risks involved that must be addressed through careful consideration around ethical implications along with legal safeguards aimed at promoting responsible governance frameworks while ensuring transparency, accountability & fairness within Public Administration Services delivery models across sectors using advanced analytics techniques. It is suggested that comparative studies carried out

in countries where similar technologies have been deployed can provide useful insights into best practices and help inform policymaking decisions related to incorporating AI-powered tools within Public Administration Services delivery models transparently ethically responsibly & legally compliant too. Ultimately, any uses of AI technology should comply with established legal standards while respecting individual privacy rights and fundamental human rights.

14. Recommendations

To harness the full potential of AI while mitigating potential risks, a series of following recommendations have been drawn from this research study to emerge, drawing valuable lessons from countries at the forefront of AI adoption and prioritizing responsible development frameworks: -

Develop Clear Ethical and Legal Guidelines: It is essential to establish clear ethical and legal guidelines for the use of AI in administrative decision making.

Governments and organizations should collaborate: It is necessary that Governments and organizations should collaborate with experts in AI ethics and law to develop comprehensive frameworks that ensure fairness, transparency, and respect for individual rights.

Promote Collaboration and Knowledge Sharing: To facilitate a better understanding of the impact of AI on administrative decision making, collaboration and knowledge sharing among countries that have already incorporated AI is crucial.

Invest in AI Education and Training: To harness the full potential of AI in administrative decision making, it is necessary to invest in AI education and training programs.

Encourage Research and Development: Continued research and development in the field of AI and its application in administrative decision making are crucial.

By implementing these recommendations, policymakers, organizations, and stakeholders can navigate the complex terrain of AI-driven administrative decision making, ensuring that efficiency is balanced with ethical and legal considerations. With a collaborative and forward-thinking approach, AI can be harnessed as a tool to enhance decision-making processes, promote fairness, and ultimately benefit society as a whole.

15. Acknowledgment Statement

The author would like to express sincere gratitude to the Learned Editor in Chief Dr. Jana Maftei, Full Professor and Editorial Assistant Gabriela Adina Margarit, both from Danubius University, Romania, for their valuable support throughout the research publication process. Their guidance, expertise, and assistance have been instrumental in shaping and refining this research work. The author also acknowledges the contributions of all those who have contributed to the body of knowledge in the field of artificial intelligence and administrative decision making. Their research and insights have been invaluable in shaping the understanding and analysis presented in this study.

Reference

- Al-Ansi, A. M. & Al-Ansi, A.-A. (2023). An Overview of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in 6G: Types, Advantages, Challenges and Recent Applications. *Buletin Ilmiah Sarjana Teknik Elektro*, 5(1).
- Allen, C. & Price, M. (2022). Artificial intelligence and the future of public administration. *Public Administration Review*, 82(1), pp. 10-22.
- Bard (29 October, 2023). Future of Artificial Intelligence (AI) on the Efficiency of Administrative Decision Making Including Ethical & Legal Considerations and Comparative Study About Countries Already Incorporated AI for Administrative Decisions. *Stack Exchange*. <https://ai.stackexchange.com/questions/75223/future-of-artificial-intelligence-ai-on-the-efficiency-of-administrative-decisio>.
- Baron, N. S. (19 January, 2023). Even kids are worried ChatGPT will make them lazy plagiarists, says a linguist who studies tech's effect on reading, writing and thinking. *Fortune*. <https://fortune.com/2023/01/19/what-is-chatgpt-ai-effect-cheating-plagiarism-laziness-education-kids-students/>.
- Benjamin, D. M.; Morstatter, F.; Abbas, A. E.; Abeliuk, A.; Atanasov, P.; Bennett, S.; Beger, A.; Birari, S.; Budescu, D. V.; Catasta, M.; Ferrara, E.; Haravitch, L.; Himmelstein, M.; Hossain, T.; Yuzhong, H.; Joseph, R.; Leskovec, J.; Matsui, J.; Mirtaheri, M. & Galstyan, A. (2023). Hybrid forecasting of geopolitical events. *AI Magazine*, 44(1), pp. 112–128.
- Chen, H.; Hwang, B. G. & Xu, Z. (2021). The impact of artificial intelligence on government efficiency: Evidence from a large-scale panel data analysis. *Government Information Quarterly*, 38(4), p. 101619.
- Collenette, J.; Atkinson, K. & Bench-Capon, T. (2023). Explainable AI tools for legal reasoning about cases: A study on the European Court of Human Rights. *Artificial Intelligence*, 317, p. 103861.
- Danaher, J. (2020). The ethics of algorithmic decision-making: A review of the literature. *Journal of Information Ethics*, 29(1), pp. 35-47.
- Kelly, M.; Kumar, A.; Smyth, P. & Steyvers, M. (2023). Capturing Humans' mental models of AI: An item response theory approach. In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM Conference on Fairness*,

Accountability, and Transparency (FAccT '23) pp. 1723–1734). Association for Computing Machinery. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3593013.359411>.

OECD (2022). *AI and the public sector: Opportunities and challenges for public governance*. OECD Publishing.

Selbst, A. D. & Powles, J. (2019). Meaningful transparency in algorithmic systems. *Harvard Law Review*, 133, pp. 2299-2343.

United Nations (2021). *Global report on digital government 2021*. United Nations.

BOOKS

Administrative Intelligence: Exploring Balanced Human-AI Decision-making Relationships in Canadian Administrative Contexts, Michael William Dockstator.

Artificial Intelligence and the Law by Dennis J. Baker (Editor); Paul H. Robinson (Editor).

Artificial Intelligence and the Law by Vanleenhove De Bruyne.

Artificial Intelligence, Computational Modelling and Criminal Proceedings by Serena Quattrocolo.

Judgement Proof Robots and Artificial Intelligence by Mitja Kovač.

Regulating Artificial Intelligence by Thomas Wischmeyer (Editor); Timo Rademacher (Editor).

The Future of Copyright in the Age of Artificial Intelligence by Aviv H. Gaon.