

Chapter 3.23

Applying ICTs in Juridical Decision Making by Government Agencies

Marga Groothuis

Leiden University, The Netherlands

INTRODUCTION

Electronic government is developing throughout Europe. Increasingly, central, regional, and local governments use ICT applications to perform their tasks. In the 1970s and 1980s, computers were mainly used to perform administrative tasks (including word processing). In the 1990s, *juridical expert systems* were introduced within government organizations: software programs which can solve juridical problems, either without any human interference or with limited human interference, by means of a reasoning mechanism and a “knowledge database” (Groothuis, 2004). Furthermore, government agencies started to use new ICT applications such as the Internet and e-mail to communicate electronically with citizens.

This article examines the juridical aspects of automatic decision making and electronic communication by government agencies in The Netherlands and addresses the following questions:

1. What is the legal framework for automatic decision-making by government agencies in The Netherlands?
2. What is the juridical quality of decisions made by expert systems in practice?
3. What is the legal framework for electronic communication between government agencies and citizens in The Netherlands?
4. To what extent does *electronic government* exist in The Netherlands and what are its prospects for the period 2005-2007?

AUTOMATIC DECISION MAKING BY GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Increasingly, government organisations in The Netherlands use expert systems to make juridical decisions in individual cases under the Dutch General Administrative Law Act (*Algemene wet bestuursrecht*). Examples of juridical decisions that are made by expert systems are tax decisions, decisions under the Traffic Law Act (traffic fines),

decisions under the General Maintenance Act (maintenance grants), and decisions under the Housing Assistance Act (Bovens, Groothuis, & Van den Hoogen, 2003).

There are two categories of juridical expert systems. Expert systems in the first category support the process of juridical decision making by a civil servant. The decision is taken in “cooperation” between the computer and the civil servant. Expert systems in the second category draft juridical decisions without any human interference. In these cases the decision making process is fully automatic.

The Legal Framework

To what extent and under which conditions is automatic decision making by government agencies legal? Under Dutch administrative law, there are no specific rules for automatic decision making.¹ Therefore, government agencies are entitled to use expert systems, or other ICT applications, in their decision-making processes if they wish to do so. This does not mean, however, that the use of ICT is not bound by any rules. When government agencies make decisions, the general rules of Dutch administrative law apply. Most of these rules can be found in the *General Administrative Law Act*. Among them are several *general principles of proper administration*: rules which administrative bodies should observe in all their acts. The *justification principle*, for example, holds that an administrative body should give grounds for its decision, and that these grounds must be mentioned in the decision itself (article 3:46 and 3:47 of the General Administrative Law Act). If a decision is made by an expert system (or another ICT application), the *justification principle* requires that the reasoning (or logic) behind the automatic decision be explained. This means that the working of the ICT tool has to be transparent.

Besides the *general principles of proper administration* a second set of principles has been developed in Dutch jurisprudence: *general principles of proper use of ICT*. According to some scholars (Bovens, 1999; Franken, 1993) these principles—accessibility, confidentiality, integrity, authenticity, flexibility, and transparency—should be respected when government organizations use ICT. If, for example, a government agency uses an expert system in its decision-making process for residents permits, this system should be accessible for applicants and other citizens (principle of accessibility), function correctly (principle of integrity), and its working should be transparent (principle of transparency).

Finally, the Dutch Privacy Act (*Wet bescherming persoonsgegevens*) contains a specific provision on automatic decision making (article 42). This provision, which applies equally to government and nongovernment organisations and which forms the implementation of an EU directive², holds in its first section that:

every person has the right not to be subject to a decision which produces legal affects concerning him or significantly affects him and which is not based on automatic processing of data intended to evaluate certain personal affects relating to him.

The second section of this provision gives an exception to this main rule. It states that a person can be subject to a decision as referred to in the first section if—in short—suitable measures are taken to safeguard his legitimate interests, such as allowing him to put his point of view. This provision implies that automatic decision making by government agencies is allowed under the condition that citizens who have a legitimate interest in the decision are given the opportunity to present their views (e.g., in a public hearing).

10 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage: www.igi-global.com/chapter/applying-icts-judicial-decision-making/9799

Related Content

Impact of Performance Expectancy, Effort Expectancy, and Citizen Trust on the Adoption of Electronic Voting System in Ghana

Isaac Kofi Mensah (2020). *International Journal of Electronic Government Research* (pp. 19-32).

www.irma-international.org/article/impact-of-performance-expectancy-effort-expectancy-and-citizen-trust-on-the-adoption-of-electronic-voting-system-in-ghana/267138

Bush Administration Information Policy and Democratic Values

G. David Garson (2008). *Patriotic Information Systems* (pp. 1-26).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/bush-administration-information-policy-democratic/28013

Competency Trap in Organizational Learning: Turkish E-Government Gateway Application During the COVID-19 Pandemic

Ayşe Asli Yılmaz and Sule Erdem Tuzlukaya (2022). *International Journal of Electronic Government Research* (pp. 1-13).

www.irma-international.org/article/competency-trap-in-organizational-learning/288068

The "Quicksilver Initiatives" as a Framework for e-Government Strategy Design in Developing Economies

Kelvin Joseph Bwalya, Tanya Du Plessis and Chris Rensleigh (2012). *Digital Democracy: Concepts, Methodologies, Tools, and Applications* (pp. 267-285).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/quicksilver-initiatives-framework-government-strategy/67611

Soft or Hard Power in Diplomacy

Elifnur Terziolu (2023). *Maintaining International Relations Through Digital Public Diplomacy Policies and Discourses* (pp. 51-64).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/soft-or-hard-power-in-diplomacy/314412