



Raach Amar

E-mail: raachamar21@gmail.com

Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0009-0006-3493-4233>

University of Djelfa

Amar, R. (2026). The gap between administrative legality and digital reality: automated administrative decisions as a case study in the Wilaya of Djelfa. *Portal de la Ciencia*, 7(3), 410-420, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51247/pdlc.v7i3.763>

==== o ====

The gap between administrative legality and digital reality: automated administrative decisions as a case study in the Wilaya of Djelfa

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the growing gap between formal guarantees of administrative legality and the practical conditions generated by automated workflow systems in Algerian local administration. The objective is to assess whether automated administrative decisions comply with the legal obligation to provide adequate reasoning and to identify the institutional factors affecting such compliance. A mixed-methods design was employed. The quantitative component analyzed 52 automated processing records collected from four local administration offices in the Wilaya of Djelfa using the Legality Compliance Protocol (LCP), whose validity and reliability were previously established. The qualitative component involved 31 semi-structured interviews with section heads, supervisors, processing officers, and legal affairs staff. The findings reveal that 69.2% of the examined records failed to meet the legality compliance threshold, indicating that legal reasoning embedded within workflow rules is often not communicated to citizens. Significant differences were observed across administrative sectors, with commercial registration decisions demonstrating higher levels of factual reasoning adequacy than housing and social benefit decisions. Interview data showed that compliance deficiencies are primarily associated with organizational practices rather than technological limitations. The study concludes that the legality gap originates from the mismatch between legal standards designed for human deliberation and automated processing environments. It proposes the Automated Administrative Legality Framework (AALF) as a governance model to strengthen transparency, accountability, and legal compliance in digital public administration.

Keywords: Administrative legality; Automated decision-making; Digital governance; Public administration.

==== o ====

La brecha entre la legalidad administrativa y la realidad digital: las decisiones administrativas automatizadas como estudio de caso en la Wilaya de Djelfa

RESUMEN

Este estudio examina la creciente brecha entre las garantías formales de la legalidad

administrativa y las condiciones prácticas generadas por los sistemas automatizados de gestión en la administración local argelina. El objetivo fue evaluar el cumplimiento de la obligación legal de motivación en las decisiones administrativas automatizadas e identificar los factores institucionales que influyen en dicho cumplimiento. Se empleó un diseño de métodos mixtos. La fase cuantitativa analizó 52 expedientes procesados automáticamente en cuatro oficinas administrativas de la Wilaya de Djelfa mediante el Protocolo de Cumplimiento de Legalidad (LCP), previamente validado y sometido a pruebas de confiabilidad. La fase cualitativa incluyó 31 entrevistas semiestructuradas con jefes de sección, supervisores, funcionarios responsables del procesamiento y personal jurídico. Los resultados mostraron que el 69,2 % de los expedientes no alcanzó el umbral de cumplimiento legal, evidenciando que la fundamentación jurídica incorporada en las reglas de los sistemas automatizados no suele ser comunicada adecuadamente a los ciudadanos. Asimismo, se identificaron diferencias significativas entre sectores administrativos, siendo los procedimientos de registro comercial los que presentaron mejores niveles de motivación que los relacionados con vivienda y beneficios sociales. Se concluye que esta brecha surge de la incompatibilidad entre estándares jurídicos concebidos para decisiones deliberativas humanas y entornos de procesamiento automatizado. Se propone el Marco de Legalidad Administrativa Automatizada (AALF) como modelo para fortalecer la transparencia, la rendición de cuentas y el cumplimiento normativo en la administración pública digital.

Palabras clave: Legalidad administrativa; Decisiones automatizadas; Gobernanza digital; Administración pública.

==== o ====

A lacuna entre a legalidade administrativa e a realidade digital: as decisões administrativas automatizadas como estudo de caso na Wilaya de Djelfa

RESUMO

Este estudo examina a crescente lacuna entre as garantias formais da legalidade administrativa e as condições práticas geradas pelos sistemas automatizados de processamento na administração local argelina. O objetivo foi avaliar o cumprimento da obrigação legal de fundamentação nas decisões administrativas automatizadas e identificar os fatores institucionais que influenciam esse cumprimento. Foi adotado um desenho de métodos mistos. A etapa quantitativa analisou 52 processos automatizados provenientes de quatro repartições administrativas da Wilaya de Djelfa por meio do Protocolo de Conformidade com a Legalidade (LCP), previamente validado e submetido a testes de confiabilidade. A etapa qualitativa compreendeu 31 entrevistas semiestructuradas com chefes de seção, supervisores, agentes responsáveis pelo processamento e profissionais da área jurídica. Os resultados revelaram que 69,2% dos processos analisados não atingiram o limite de conformidade legal, demonstrando que a fundamentação jurídica incorporada às regras dos sistemas automatizados frequentemente não é comunicada aos cidadãos. Também foram observadas diferenças significativas entre setores administrativos, sendo os procedimentos de registro comercial superiores aos relacionados à habitação e aos benefícios sociais quanto à adequação da fundamentação. Conclui-se que essa lacuna decorre da incompatibilidade entre padrões jurídicos concebidos para decisões humanas deliberativas e ambientes de processamento automatizado. O estudo propõe o Marco de Legalidade Administrativa Automatizada (AALF) como modelo para fortalecer a transparência, a responsabilização e a conformidade legal na administração pública digital.

Palavras-chave: Legalidade administrativa; Decisões automatizadas; Governança digital; Administração pública.

INTRODUCTION

Start with a simple scene. A resident of Djelfa submits a housing assistance application. Days later, a letter arrives. It says, in effect: your application does not satisfy the eligibility conditions. It cites a regulation. That is all.

The resident cannot tell from this letter which condition they failed to meet. They cannot tell whether their income was calculated correctly, or whether the household size criterion was even applied. They do not know that a processing system — not a named official — generated the decision. They see an official stamp and assume a person reviewed their file. In most cases, no one did.

This is not a hypothetical. It describes 37 of the 52 records analyzed for this study — the dominant pattern across four local administration offices in Djelfa. And it raises a question that Algerian administrative law scholarship has not yet systematically addressed: does the obligation de motivation mean anything when administrative decisions emerge from automated processing systems whose reasoning pathway is nowhere visible in the decision document?

The answer this study arrives at is: not currently, but it should — and the legal tools to make it so already exist.

The distinction between what this study addresses and what it does not address matters from the outset. There is a lively international debate about AI systems in public administration — about algorithmic bias, machine learning opacity, and the governance of autonomous decision systems. That debate does not apply here. Djelfa's local administration offices do not deploy AI systems. What they deploy are automated workflow systems: rule-based processing environments that apply pre-specified eligibility criteria to application data and generate outputs without any official reviewing the individual case. These systems are not mysterious. Their outputs are fully derivable from their rule sets. The problem they create is not one of opaque AI but of a legal standard — the obligation de motivation — that was designed for human deliberative decisions and has not been updated to address a processing mode that has quietly replaced significant portions of that deliberation.

Three questions guide the study. What does the existing Algerian legal framework require of automated administrative decisions? What do automated decisions actually look like in practice? And what minimum normative standard would close the gap between the two?

Legal Framework

What the Law Says

The constitutional foundation sits in Articles 157 and 158 of the 2020 Constitution: the right to judicial control of administrative acts and the right to effective remedy. These apply to automated decisions in principle. The practical question is whether citizens can exercise them — and that requires, at minimum, knowing what the decision was based on.

Law No. 08-09 of 25 February 2008 is the central instrument. Article 829 requires that restrictive individual administrative decisions state their legal basis (*fondement juridique*) and factual basis (*motifs de fait*). The first requirement — citing the applicable provision — is met consistently in the corpus analyzed here. Every decision, without exception, correctly cited an applicable legal provision (LCP-1 median = 2.0, IQR = 0.0 across all sectors). The second requirement — communicating the factual basis — is not. The median LCP-2 score across the full corpus was 1.0, the “formulaic conclusion” level, meaning decisions that state an outcome without specifying how or why that outcome was reached.

Law No. 09-04 on electronic transactions validates electronic administrative acts as a formal matter. It treats automated delivery as a procedural question and says nothing about the substantive content of automatically produced decisions. Law No. 18-07 on personal data

protection touches automated data processing but creates no rights specific to automated administrative decision-making.

The gap, doctrinally stated, is this: no provision in Algerian law requires a decision to disclose that it was produced through automated processing, to communicate the eligibility criteria the system applied, or to specify what the system determined about the individual applicant's situation.

What the Courts Have Said — And Where They Stop

The Conseil d'État algérien's jurisprudence on the obligation de motivation contains resources that are relevant here, even if they were not developed with automated decisions in mind.

The administrative chamber has consistently held that motivation is a substantive requirement, not a formal one. A decision that cites a provision and states a conclusion does not satisfy the obligation if the affected person cannot understand from it why they were treated as they were (Boussoumah, 2021, pp. 230–237). This holding is directly applicable to the "template refusal" pattern documented in this study. Decisions that correctly cite Article X and conclude that conditions are unsatisfied without specifying which conditions or what factual assessment of the applicant produced that finding fail this standard.

The Conseil d'État has also required, in several documented instances, that administrative authorities produce processing records as evidence in appeal proceedings (Zeghdoud, 2018, pp. 312–317). These decisions are case-specific and do not constitute a general doctrine. But they establish a precedent: processing records can be compelled through existing appeal mechanisms. That emergent practice is what the AALF's third requirement proposes to systematize.

The court has not yet developed a general doctrine for automated administrative decisions. That development is overdue, and this study's doctrinal analysis is offered as a contribution to it.

Four Gaps in the Framework

Four structural lacunae emerge from the analysis.

The first is the absence of any automated processing disclosure obligation. Citizens receiving automated decisions have no right to know that a processing system rather than an individual official determined their outcome, and no right to the criteria that system applied.

The second is the absence of a right to individual human review. The recours gracieux formally available under Law No. 08-09 does not create this right; in practice, it typically results in re-processing through the same automated system.

The third is the inadequacy of the existing appeal procedure for decisions whose factual reasoning is inaccessible. The recours pour excès de pouvoir requires identifying a specific legal error. When the decision communicates no factual reasoning, identifying specific factual errors is structurally impossible without access to the processing system's records — access that no current provision compels.

The fourth is the absence of any prior documentation requirement before deploying automated processing systems in rights-affecting service areas.

Comparative References

Three comparative frameworks inform this study's normative proposals, selected for legal proximity and analytic relevance rather than prestige.

French administrative law is the natural first reference, given Algerian administrative law's direct lineage from the French model (Ben Youcef, 2019; Boussoumah, 2021). The loi pour une République numérique (Law No. 2016-1321 of 7 October 2016) established the first

statutory right of explanation for algorithmic administrative decisions in any legal system. Its implementing decree (Décret No. 2017-330 of 14 March 2017) specifies what must be communicated: the degree of automation, principal data categories used, and weighting criteria applied. Kouzmine (2018) and Monnot (2020) develop the doctrinal implications in ways directly relevant to the Algerian obligation de motivation extension question.

The Tunisian experience offers a regionally proximate comparison. Gharbi (2019), writing in the *Revue Internationale des Sciences Administratives*, documents a comparable gap between e-government deployment and administrative legality guarantees in Tunisia — a legal system sharing the French-heritage administrative law model with Algeria. The parallel is instructive: the motivation gap identified in Djelfa is not an Algerian peculiarity but a structural pattern across Arab administrative systems that have digitalized service delivery without adapting their legality frameworks.

European standards — GDPR Article 22 and the EU AI Act (Regulation (EU) 2024/1689) — are referenced as international benchmarks rather than applicable norms. They indicate where comparable legal systems are moving and define a baseline against which the Algerian regulatory gap can be assessed.

The Arab Administrative Justice Network’s (2021) comparative synthesis confirms the regional dimension: the same structural gap appears across Arab legal systems that have deployed electronic services without updating their administrative legality standards.

Methodology

Design

The study employs an analytical-field design. Doctrinal analysis of the normative framework (Phase 1) establishes the legal criteria. Systematic field analysis of administrative processing records and practitioner interviews (Phase 2) tests those criteria against actual practice. The two phases are genuinely integrated: Phase 1 results determined what the LCP measures; Phase 1 findings identified the interpretive questions that Phase 2 interviews were designed to address.

Field Access

Access was obtained through direct negotiation with the head of each participating office, supported by a research facilitation letter from the Dean of the Faculty of Law, University of Djelfa. No access was sought from wilaya-level political authorities. Each office head authorized access independently, subject to conditions the researcher proposed: on-site review only; personal data anonymization before access; restriction to records from 2021–2023; exclusion of records in active litigation.

Table 1

Field Sample

Office	Sector	Records
APC Djelfa — Service Urbanisme et État Civil	Civil documentation	14
Direction de l’Habitat et de l’Urbanisme (DHU)	Housing allocation	16
Direction de l’Action Sociale (DAS)	Social benefit determination	13
Guichet Unique des Entreprises (GUE)	Commercial registration	9
Total		52

Automated origin was verified for each record through electronic metadata, section head confirmation, and processing log cross-reference for a 20% subsample. Three records were excluded when automated origin could not be confirmed.

Interview Sample

Thirty-one interviews with practitioners who work directly with the automated processing systems: section heads, unit supervisors, processing officers, and legal affairs staff. External perspectives — from lawyers and appellate reviewers — are acknowledged as relevant to future research but outside this study's focus on operational compliance practice.

Table 2

Interview Participants

Category	n
Section heads	8
Unit supervisors	9
Processing officers	7
Legal affairs officers	4
Citizen services desk staff	3
Total	31

Interviews: 40–65 minutes, in Algerian Arabic and Darija, recorded with written consent. Thematic analysis per Braun and Clarke (2006). Inter-coder $\kappa = .81$ (30% subsample; Landis & Koch, 1977).

The LCP Instrument

Four criteria, each grounded in a specific Algerian legal provision:

Table 3

LCP Scoring

Criterion	Legal basis	0	1	2	3	Max
LCP-1: Legal basis	Art. 829 Law 08-09	Absent	Generic	Specific provision	—	2
LCP-2: Factual reasoning	Art. 829 Law 08-09	Absent	Formulaic	Partial	Adequate	3
LCP-3: Human review disclosure	Law 08-09 appeals	Absent	Generic reference	Specific procedure	—	2
LCP-4: Automated processing disclosure	Arts. 157–158 Constitution	Absent	Partial	Adequate	—	2

Maximum: 9. Threshold: ≤ 5 = failing (expert consensus, $n = 5$, 4/5 agreement; Boussoumah, 2021).

Validation: Content validity index: LCP-1 I-CVI = 0.92, LCP-2 = 0.88, LCP-3 = 0.83, LCP-4 = 0.80; S-CVI/Ave = 0.858 (Lynn, 1986; Polit & Beck, 2006). Construct validity: $r = .72$, $p < .001$ against independent practitioner quality ratings. Inter-rater reliability: $\kappa = .79$ (Landis & Koch, 1977). The LCP-4 score of 0.80 — the lowest — reflects genuine disagreement among two panel members about whether the constitutional right to effective remedy generates a specific automated disclosure obligation without explicit statutory text. That doctrinal uncertainty is noted as such throughout.

Statistical Methods

Non-parametric throughout. Medians and IQR for central tendency. Kruskal–Wallis H for between-sector comparisons; Bonferroni-corrected Mann–Whitney U post-hoc ($\alpha = .0083$). Wilson score CIs for proportions (Brown et al., 2001). Findings bounded to the studied organizations.

RESULTS

Compliance by Sector

Table 4

LCP Results

Sector	n	LCP-1 [IQR]	Mdn	LCP-2 [IQR]	Mdn	LCP-3 [IQR]	Mdn	LCP-4 [IQR]	Mdn	Total [IQR]	Mdn	Failing n (%) [95% CI]
APC	14	2.0 [0.0]		1.0 [1.0]		0.0 [1.0]		0.0 [0.0]		3.0 [2.0]		10 (71.4%) [41.9–91.6%]
DHU	16	2.0 [0.0]		1.0 [1.0]		1.0 [1.0]		0.0 [0.0]		4.0 [2.0]		11 (68.8%) [41.3–88.9%]
DAS	13	2.0 [0.0]		1.0 [1.25]		0.0 [1.0]		0.0 [0.0]		3.0 [2.0]		11 (84.6%) [54.6–98.1%]
GUE	9	2.0 [0.0]		2.0 [1.0]		1.0 [1.0]		0.0 [0.0]		5.0 [2.0]		4 (44.4%) [13.7–78.8%]
Overall	52	2.0 [0.0]		1.0 [1.0]		0.5 [1.0]		0.0 [0.0]		3.5 [2.0]		36 (69.2%) [54.8–80.8%]

Kruskal–Wallis: LCP-2 $H(3) = 8.74$, $p = .033$, $\eta^2 = .12$. LCP-1: $H(3) = 2.13$, $p = .546$. LCP-3: $H(3) = 4.87$, $p = .182$. LCP-4: $H(3) = 1.42$, $p = .701$. Post-hoc LCP-2: GUE vs DAS $U = 28$, $p = .019$; GUE vs APC $U = 31$, $p = .024$; GUE vs DHU $U = 52$, $p = .214$.

Three things stand out. First: LCP-1 is perfect everywhere. Every decision cites a legal provision. The formal layer of the obligation de motivation is working. Second: LCP-4 is effectively zero everywhere. Fifty of 52 records provide no indication of automated processing. Citizens have no basis for knowing their decision was system-generated. Third: LCP-2 varies significantly by sector, and that variation tells a story worth attending to carefully.

What the Records Actually Say

Three patterns emerge from close reading.

Pattern 1 — Template refusal (37 records, 71.2%): The decision cites the provision, states the conclusion, and stops there. From a DAS record: “Following examination of your file, we inform you that your application does not satisfy the eligibility conditions established by Executive Decree No. [X].” That is the entire factual content. No specification of which condition. No indication of what the system determined about this applicant’s income, household size, or housing situation. From a citizen’s perspective: you know you failed; you do not know why; and you have no way to find out.

Pattern 2 — Partial reasoning (11 records, 21.2%): At least one criterion is specified with its threshold value. From DHU: “Your declared monthly income of X,XXX dinars exceeds the ceiling applicable to Category B housing assistance under Article [X] of Circular [Y].” This is better. The income criterion is addressed. But housing assistance eligibility also depends on household size and current housing conditions — criteria the decision says nothing about. Partial transparency is still partial opacity.

Pattern 3 — Adequate reasoning (4 records, 7.7%): All determinative criteria identified, determinations stated, reasoning pathway communicable. All four examples are from GUE. This pattern exists. It is produced by the same kind of electronic system used in the other offices. Its existence is the most practically important finding in the study, because it means the motivation gap is not a technical inevitability. It is a template design choice.

One DAS record sits outside these patterns and warrants separate mention. A benefit termination notice cited income threshold exceedance as the basis; the income figure in the notice differed from the figure in the beneficiary’s paper file held in the same directorate. An input data error. Nobody flagged it. The citizen had no way to see it. This is a different problem from the motivation gap — not about reasoning opacity but about factual accuracy — and it is equally serious. Automated processing systems do not catch their own input errors the way deliberating officials sometimes do.

What Practitioners Say

Five themes emerged across 303 coded interview segments.

Template decisions as organizational standard (31.7%): Processing officers described template-based output as what the system generates and what organizational procedure requires — not as a deliberate choice to withhold information. “The template is what the system produces. We don’t add to it. Our role is to check the data and submit.” Section heads confirmed signing batches of system-generated decisions without reviewing individual factual reasoning. The premise is that the system got it right and no supplement is needed.

No awareness of automated disclosure obligation (25.7%): Legal affairs officers were asked directly: does a citizen have any right to know their decision was generated by a processing system? The answer, without exception, was no — and they were legally correct. “We have the obligation to state the legal basis and communicate appeal rights. That we use an electronic processing system — this is an administrative instrument. We are not required to mention it.” Accurate under current law. That is the problem.

Motivation understood as formal compliance (20.1%): Several section heads described the obligation de motivation as satisfied by citing the provision and stating the outcome. “Everyone knows what ‘conditions not satisfied’ means.” The assumption is that the citizen knows which conditions the system evaluated. They do not. That is precisely the information the decision withholds.

Citizens unable to use appeal mechanisms (17.2%): Desk staff described a consistent pattern. Citizens with refusals ask what to do. Staff tell them they can appeal to the administrative tribunal. Citizens ask what to say. Staff cannot answer, because the decision does not say what was wrong. “The paper says they can appeal. But appeal on what grounds? The paper doesn’t give them grounds.”

Internal quality control absent (5.3%): Four legal officers across the four offices acknowledged that no internal procedure exists for reviewing whether system-generated decisions meet the motivation standard. The decision is issued as the system produces it. No one checks.

DISCUSSION

Not a Compliance Problem

The 69.2% failure rate is tempting to read as evidence of widespread non-compliance that better enforcement would address. That reading is wrong. Section heads and processing officers are not evading their legal obligations. They are applying organizational procedures that their training directs and their system design enables. The compliance gap exists because those procedures satisfy the obligation de motivation as it is currently understood and applied — and that current understanding is inadequate for the automated decision context.

The standard, as currently applied, requires citing a legal provision and stating a factual conclusion. An automated workflow system can produce a document that does both. What the standard does not yet require — because it was designed before automated decisions existed — is disclosing the processing pathway through which the factual determination was reached. The decision is formally legal. Substantively, it communicates nothing about why this particular applicant received this particular outcome.

Enforcing the current standard more rigorously will not change this. The gap is in the standard, not in its application. Extending the standard — through judicial interpretation or legislative reform — is what the situation requires.

The GUE Exception Changes the Reform Agenda

The four adequate records in the commercial registration sector are more significant than their small number suggests. They are produced by the same type of electronic processing system used in the social benefit and civil documentation offices. Their existence proves that adequate automated processing motivation is achievable with existing infrastructure. The difference between GUE and DAS is not technology — it is template design. The GUE decision template was designed to specify the criteria evaluated and the determination made on each. The DAS template was designed to state the conclusion only.

This shifts the immediate reform conversation from the legislative track to the administrative track. A directive requiring housing, social benefit, and civil documentation offices to redesign their decision templates — requiring the processing system to output the criteria applied and the determinations made — would address the dominant compliance gap without requiring statutory change. It would cost nothing beyond the administrative time to update the template parameters.

Legislative reform is still needed for Lacunae 2 through 4 — the right to human review, the adapted appeal procedure, and the prior documentation requirement. But the template redesign is addressable now, by the offices themselves, and the GUE records demonstrate that it is feasible.

The AALF

The Automated Administrative Legality Framework specifies four minimum requirements. Each is an extension of an obligation already present in Algerian law, not an import from a foreign legal system.

AALF-1 — Automated processing disclosure and factual transparency: Any restrictive automated workflow decision must state: (a) that automated processing determined the outcome; (b) the principal eligibility criteria applied; and (c) the specific determination made about the applicant on the criterion or criteria that produced the refusal. This operationalizes motifs de fait for the automated context — extending it from “state the conclusion” to “state what the system decided about this applicant.”

AALF-2 — Right to individual human review: Any person subject to a restrictive automated decision must have a right to request review by a named official with authority to make an individual determination on the merits. Re-processing through the same automated system does not satisfy this requirement.

AALF-3 — Adapted appeal procedure: Administrative authorities, when a formal challenge is filed against an automated decision, must produce the processing criteria applied, the input data used, and any processing log records preserving the individual decision pathway. This systematizes the emergent Conseil d’État precedent documented by Zeghdoud (2018) into a stable procedural standard.

AALF-4 — Prior processing documentation: Before deploying automated processing in rights-affecting service areas, public authorities must document: the criteria and thresholds applied, the oversight mechanisms maintained, and the procedure for challenging processing errors. This is a transparency obligation, not an authorization requirement.

Limitations

Several constraints bound these findings and should be stated plainly.

The sample is 52 records from four offices in one wilaya. It cannot represent the full range of Algerian local administrative practice. The structural patterns identified — template refusal dominance, universal absence of processing disclosure — are driven by the absence of legal obligations rather than by Djelfa-specific factors, which suggests they would appear in comparable offices elsewhere. But this inference is theoretical, not empirical.

The LCP is a first-generation instrument. Its validation results (S-CVI = 0.858, $r = .72$, $\kappa = .79$) are encouraging but require replication in other contexts. The LCP-4 threshold in particular rests on a doctrinal argument about the constitutional right to effective remedy that two of six expert panelists found insufficiently grounded in explicit statutory text — a disagreement that maps onto a genuine doctrinal uncertainty the study acknowledges rather than resolves.

The interview sample excludes external practitioners — administrative lawyers, appellate reviewers, citizen rights advocates — whose perspectives on the downstream consequences of the compliance gap would add an important dimension this study's focus on operational practice does not capture.

CONCLUSION

The citizen who received the housing refusal at the beginning of this paper was not wronged by a malicious official or a defective system. They were placed in a gap between what public law formally guarantees and what digital administrative practice actually delivers. That gap is structural, not accidental. It will persist as long as the obligation de motivation continues to be interpreted as satisfied by template language that states a legal provision and a conclusion — because that interpretation was developed for human deliberative decisions and has not been extended to address the automated decision mode that has quietly replaced significant portions of that deliberation.

Three things can close the gap. Courts can read the existing motifs de fait standard as requiring, for automated decisions, communication of the processing pathway's factual determinations — an extension consistent with the Conseil d'État algérien's own substantive approach to motivation adequacy (Boussoumah, 2021). Administrators can redesign decision templates in housing and social benefit sectors to produce the factual specificity that the GUE template already produces. And legislators can enact the four AALF requirements as a statutory framework that makes the judicial and administrative developments permanent and accessible.

None of these is complicated. What has been missing, so far, is the acknowledgment that the problem exists.

REFERENCES

- Arab Administrative Justice Network. (2021). Digital administrative decisions in Arab legal systems: A comparative synthesis. Arab Organization for Administrative Development, Cairo. [aoad.org]
- Ben Youcef, M. (2019). Les garanties procédurales dans le contentieux administratif algérien. Dar El Khaldounia, Algiers.
- Boussoumah, M. (2021). Le Conseil d'État algérien: Organisation, compétences et jurisprudence (3rd ed.). ENAG Éditions, Algiers.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp0630a>
- Conseil d'État français. (2022). Réguler les algorithmes: Rapport annuel 2022. La Documentation française. [conseil-etat.fr]
- European Parliament. (2024). Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 on Artificial Intelligence. OJ L 2024/1689. [EUR-Lex]
- Gharbi, M. (2019). La transformation numérique de l'administration tunisienne. *Revue Internationale des Sciences Administratives*, 85(3), 491–510. <https://doi.org/10.3917/risa.853.0491>

- Kouzmine, I. (2018). La transparence de l'algorithme administratif en droit français. *Revue Française de Droit Administratif*, 34(4), 712–729. [Dalloz; HeinOnline]
- Landis, J. R., & Koch, G. G. (1977). The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. *Biometrics*, 33(1), 159–174. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2529310>
- Lynn, M. R. (1986). Determination and quantification of content validity. *Nursing Research*, 35(6), 382–386. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00006199-198611000-00017>
- Monnot, P. (2020). L'obligation de motivation des décisions administratives algorithmiques. *Actualité Juridique Droit Administratif*, 76(12), 682–689. [Dalloz]
- Polit, D. F., & Beck, C. T. (2006). The content validity index. *Research in Nursing & Health*, 29(5), 489–497. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nur.20147>
- République Algérienne Démocratique et Populaire. (2008). *Loi n° 08-09 du 25 février 2008 portant code de procédure civile et administrative*. Journal officiel de la République algérienne démocratique et populaire (JORADP), n° 21. [JORADP n° 21 \(2008\)](#)
- République Algérienne Démocratique et Populaire. (2009). *Loi n° 09-04 du 5 août 2009 fixant les règles générales relatives à la signature et à la certification électroniques*. Journal officiel de la République algérienne démocratique et populaire (JORADP), n° 44.
- République Algérienne Démocratique et Populaire. (2018). *Loi n° 18-07 du 10 juin 2018 relative à la protection des personnes physiques dans le traitement des données à caractère personnel*. Journal officiel de la République algérienne démocratique et populaire (JORADP), n° 34.
- République Algérienne Démocratique et Populaire. (2020). *Constitution de la République Algérienne Démocratique et Populaire*. Journal officiel de la République algérienne démocratique et populaire (JORADP), n° 82, 30 décembre 2020.
- République Française. (2016). *Loi n° 2016-1321 du 7 octobre 2016 pour une République numérique*. Journal officiel de la République française (JORF), n° 235, 8 octobre 2016
- République Française. (2017). *Décret n° 2017-330 du 14 mars 2017 relatif aux droits des personnes faisant l'objet de décisions individuelles prises sur le fondement d'un traitement algorithmique*. Journal officiel de la République française (JORF), n° 0064
- Zeghdoud, A. (2018). *Le contrôle juridictionnel de l'administration en Algérie: Théorie et pratique*. Presses Universitaires d'Alger.