

1. INTRODUCTION

Public administration is currently undergoing profound transformations driven by the digital revolution and the rapid advancement of information technologies and artificial intelligence. These shifts call for a reconsideration of traditional models of public management, which have long been characterized by rigid bureaucracy and centralized control. Administrative efficiency alone is no longer sufficient to address contemporary complexities; there is now an urgent need to develop frameworks of **smart governance** that combine learning capacity, rapid responsiveness, and transparency in decision-making. Within this context, smart governance emerges as both a theoretical and practical paradigm that integrates modern technologies with the requirements of effective

This study seeks to analyze this concept by exploring the digital tools that have a transformative impact on public administration, such as **big data, predictive algorithms, and automation**, while also drawing on leading international experiences. It further emphasizes the ethical and legal challenges of digital transformation, including the protection of privacy, the prevention of bias, and the assurance of transparency and legal accountability. In addition, it highlights the future potential of **participatory governance**, which enhances citizen involvement in policymaking. Through this framework, the paper aims to provide a comprehensive vision for reengineering public administration in a manner that balances technological innovation with institutional responsibility, ensuring that public management remains capable of addressing the challenges of the digital age with efficiency and effectiveness.

1.1 Problem Statement

Smart governance constitutes a contemporary framework for reshaping public administration in the era of the digital revolution. However, this transformation raises profound scientific and academic concerns regarding administrative effectiveness, the legitimacy of decision-making, and the capacity to adapt to the complex dynamics of digital

society. While digital tools such as **big data, predictive algorithms, and automation** offer opportunities to enhance efficiency, reduce costs, and improve the quality of public services, a central question remains: to **what extent can these systems strike a balance between technological innovation and democratic accountability?**

Main Research Question

How can smart governance reshape public administration in the context of the digital revolution while ensuring a balance between technological innovation, administrative efficiency, and democratic accountability?

Sub-questions

- a. What are the contemporary concepts and theories in public administration that explain the emergence of smart governance and the evolution of its tools?
- b. How do big data, predictive algorithms, automation, and robotics influence decision-making and the delivery of public services?
- c. What are the ethical and legal risks associated with digital transformation, including privacy, algorithmic bias, transparency, and accountability?
- d. How can citizens be engaged through open digital platforms, and how can an administrative and legal culture be developed to reinforce accountability and innovation in public administration?

1-2- Research Methodology

This study adopts a comparative analytical-interpretive approach that combines theoretical analysis with insights drawn from international practical experiences in order to understand the dimensions of smart governance within public administration. The methodology is structured around four fundamental pillars:

Firstly, Theoretical Analysis:

The study analyzes NPM, network, and interactive governance theories to define smart governance and contextualize it within administrative transformations.

Secondly, Analysis of Digital Tools and Modern Technologies:

The study examines big data, algorithms, automation, and robotics, evaluating their effects on decision-making, public service, and digital versus traditional administration.

Thirdly, Critical Analysis of Ethical and Legal Dimensions:

This entails examining the risks associated with digital transformation, such as algorithmic bias, privacy challenges, and issues of transparency and accountability. The analysis draws on the literature of digital law and applied ethics to provide a scientifically balanced evaluation.

Fourthly, Comparative Extrapolation of International Experiences:

The study examines digital transformation in Estonia, South Korea, UAE, and Singapore, highlighting lessons on participatory governance and citizen engagement.

1-3- Research Objectives

- a. To analyze the concept of smart governance and its position within the major transformations in administrative thought.
- b. To highlight the role of artificial intelligence tools in influencing decision-making within public administration.
- c. To discuss the ethical and legal challenges associated with digital transformation.
- d. To explore the potential of building participatory governance that ensures citizen engagement and promotes transparency.
- e. To provide a forward-looking vision for developing public administration that balances technological transformation with institutional responsibility.

The study is divided into four main axes:

Axis I: The conceptual and theoretical framework of smart governance.

Axis II: Artificial intelligence tools in public administration.

Axis III: The ethical and legal challenges of smart governance.

Axis IV: Prospects of participatory and future-oriented governance.

2- The Conceptual and Theoretical Framework of Smart Governance

2.1- The Evolution of the Concept of Governance

The concept of governance emerged in the 1990s with the efforts of international financial institutions and the World Bank, which emphasized the principles of good governance as a gateway to reforming administrative and political systems. This stage focused on key elements such as transparency, accountability, the rule of law, and participation (World Bank, 1992, p. 3).

With the advent of digital transformations, the debate shifted toward e-governance, representing the use of information and communication technologies in managing public affairs, whether in the delivery of services or in engaging citizens in the political process (Heeks, 2001, p. 15).

Today, the concept is undergoing a new shift with the rise of smart governance, which goes beyond the mere digitization of administrative processes. It employs artificial intelligence, big data, and predictive applications to redesign the administrative and institutional system in a more flexible and interactive manner (Gil-Garcia et al., 2018, p. 162).

2-2- Theoretical Foundations of Smart Governance

Smart governance can be understood within the trajectory of modern administrative thought, which has sought to overcome the limitations of traditional bureaucracy. Several theories in public administration have served as starting points to conceptualize this transformation, most notably:

a) New Public Management - NPM

This approach emerged in the 1980s as a reaction to criticisms of classical bureaucracy, which was accused of rigidity, complexity, and inefficiency. NPM emphasized borrowing tools and methods from the private sector, particularly through:

- Enhancing economic efficiency by reducing waste and achieving optimal results with minimal resources.

- Measuring performance through quantitative indicators subject to continuous evaluation.
- - Encouraging competition among public units and institutions, viewing it as a driver of innovation.

This vision paved the way for the integration of technology as a fundamental means to improve administrative performance. Digital systems and artificial intelligence are thus considered a natural extension of the philosophy of “results-oriented public management” (Hood, 1991, p. 4). Nevertheless, this approach has been criticized for its excessive focus on technical and economic dimensions at the expense of social justice and the human dimension.

b. Network Governance

By the late 1990s, network governance arose, enabling multi-stakeholder collaboration; smart governance uses digital technologies, AI, and big data to facilitate interactive, knowledge-based, and collective decision-making. (Rhodes, 1996, p. 657).

However, this model raises significant challenges in terms of power distribution: does technology serve as a tool to balance relationships among actors, or does it reinforce the state’s capacity for centralized surveillance?

c. Interactive Governance

Kooiman (2003) introduced a perspective that goes beyond the traditional state–market dichotomy, emphasizing that complex problems such as cybersecurity, climate change, or the management of smart cities cannot be addressed by a single actor. Instead, they require creative interaction among diverse social and political stakeholders.

Participatory digital platforms enable citizen involvement and oversight, integrating efficiency, networks, and interaction in smart governance, while raising questions about transparency versus centralized digital control.

2.3. Characteristics of Smart Governance

Smart governance does not merely consist in using digital technologies for public affairs management; rather, it is distinguished by a set of structural features that differentiate it from both e-governance and classical bureaucracy. The most notable characteristics include:

a. Flexibility

Flexibility is a defining feature of smart governance, allowing administrations to swiftly adapt policies to changing conditions. Unlike rigid bureaucracy, it emphasizes dynamic digital solutions. South Korea's COVID-19 response exemplifies this, showing how real-time data enabled rapid adjustments without abandoning clear regulatory frameworks.

b. Continuous Learning

Smart governance uses AI and machine learning for real-time process improvement, anomaly detection, and solutions, exemplified by Singapore's traffic management reducing congestion through adaptive algorithms (Nam & Pardo, 2011, p. 285).

This dimension positions smart governance as a system that "learns from its mistakes," in contrast to rigid bureaucratic models.

c. Predictive Responsiveness

One of the core features of smart governance is its proactive—rather than merely reactive—character. By leveraging Big Data, public administrations can anticipate problems before they occur.

For instance, Estonia's cybersecurity system employs predictive algorithms to enable the early detection of hacking attempts or cyberattacks (Dunleavy et al., 2006, p. 478). This approach shifts governance from being primarily "crisis-managing" to becoming a "proactive problem-solving" system.

d. Digital Transparency

Transparency in smart governance relies on open data, empowering citizens with oversight and accountability. The UAE's Open Data Portal exemplifies this, fostering trust and enabling citizens to actively participate in governance through digital transparency.

e. Knowledge Management

Smart governance relies on knowledge management rather than merely managing documents and procedures. The core value lies in transforming the continuous flow of information into strategic knowledge that supports decision-making.

According to Meijer & Bolívar (2016, p. 394), Smart governance integrates employee expertise with intelligent systems, fostering balanced decisions and a flexible, learning-oriented state, while raising dilemmas about adaptability, disorder, and privacy protection.

3- Artificial Intelligence Tools in Public Administration

AI is transforming public administration by boosting efficiency, enhancing service delivery, and supporting decision-making. Its tools include big data, predictive algorithms, automation, robotics, and international best practices for adaptation and learning.

3-1. Big Data and Its Analytical Role in Decision Support

Big Data forms a cornerstone of smart governance, enabling evidence-based policymaking. By integrating vast datasets from government, health, education, transport, and digital platforms, administrations enhance decision-making, efficiency, and responsiveness to complex societal needs.

These datasets are defined by the well-known "4Vs": **Volume, Velocity, Variety, and Veracity**, which necessitate the use of advanced AI and machine learning techniques for effective processing and analysis.

Big Data empowers real-time, evidence-based governance, enhancing resource allocation, transport, and health management, while requiring integrated technical, legal, and ethical safeguards for efficiency, transparency, and citizen participation. (Kitchin, 2014, p. 5).

3-2- Predictive Algorithms in Public Policy Design

Big Data boosts efficiency, transparency, and citizen participation, exemplified in predictive policing, but raises ethical risks; success requires embedding strong technical, legal, and ethical safeguards in governance frameworks. (Perry et al., 2013, p. 45).

Predictive algorithms in public health, highlighted during COVID-19, forecast disease spread and prevalence, enabling proactive resource allocation, preventive strategies, and targeted health investments at community levels

In the domain of education, predictive models make it possible to detect early indicators of school dropout or to forecast students' performance based on past records, which facilitates proactive interventions aimed at supporting at-risk groups. **In the economic sphere**, predictive modeling is applied to analyze market dynamics, anticipate financial crises, and calibrate monetary and fiscal policies with greater precision.

Predictive algorithms shift governance from reactive to anticipatory, enhancing resilience through problem prediction. Yet, their success hinges on data quality, neutrality, and safeguards ensuring transparency, equity, accountability, and protection of citizens' privacy.

3-3 Automation and Robotics in Public Services.

Automation and robotics modernize public administration by enhancing service quality, speeding delivery, and reducing costs, as AI and machine learning integration minimizes human intervention in routine tasks and optimizes efficiency.

a)Service robots

Robots exemplify this technological revolution, guiding citizens in multiple languages and supporting healthcare in Japan and South Korea, improving service quality and reducing staff workload.

b) Administrative Automation

Administrative automation reduces bureaucracy by processing files electronically, issuing documents, and using chatbots for continuous citizen support. It enhances service speed, transparency, and reliability while minimizing human error and improving overall administrative efficiency.

(c) Smart Infrastructure Technologies

Smart infrastructure uses AI, drones, and robots to enhance transparency and efficiency, while ethical, inclusive strategies are needed to address job displacement and legal responsibilities. (UN E-Government Survey, 2020, p. 67).

3-4- Leading International Models

Estonia pioneered digital governance, digitizing over 99% of public services via digital ID and cloud infrastructure, boosting efficiency and transparency. Yet, challenges remain, notably privacy concerns and escalating cyberattacks on critical digital systems. (Margetts & Naumann, 2017, p. 119).

South Korea emphasizes smart administration by applying AI and Big Data in healthcare, education, and transport, enhancing service quality and future planning. Yet, the digital divide persists, challenging equity and equal access to these innovations.

By contrast, the United Arab Emirates represents an ambitious Arab model through the launch of the UAE Artificial Intelligence Strategy 2031, which aims to embed AI into all government sectors. This model is characterized by its proactive approach, seeking to reduce operational costs and enhance governmental performance. However, such ambition also raises challenges related to the ability of human resources to keep pace with the transformation, in addition to the need for legislative and ethical frameworks that ensure the responsible use of technology (UAE Government, 2018).

Singapore's Smart Nation integrates big data and intelligent technologies into daily life, enhancing quality of life while raising debates on privacy and limits of governmental oversight (Ho, 2018, p. 24).

Comparatively, Estonia embodies the most comprehensive digital governance model, South Korea prioritizes smart service delivery, the UAE pursues long-term strategic ambitions, and Singapore provides a citizen-centered approach. Yet, all face shared challenges in privacy, equity, cybersecurity, and institutional preparedness.

These models affirm AI as a strategic tool in reshaping governance, yet stress balancing innovation with rights, inclusiveness, and ethics; future success depends on leveraging AI while ensuring robust legal and ethical safeguards.

4 – Ethical and Legal Challenges of Smart Governance

4.1 – The Issue of Privacy and the Protection of Personal Data

Privacy and the protection of personal data constitute some of the most pressing ethical challenges confronting smart governance. The latter relies on the collection, processing, and circulation of vast amounts of data across multiple digital platforms. While such data enable governments to enhance decision-making processes and optimize resource allocation, they simultaneously expose individuals to significant risks of violation and intrusion.

Balancing public security with individual privacy remains a core dilemma. COVID-19 tracking apps curbed virus spread but fueled debates over surveillance, raising concerns about the permanence of such intrusive governmental practices. (Zuboff, 2019, p. 152).

Cloud data storage raises breach risks; robust frameworks like the GDPR safeguard rights, enforce transparency and consent, and ensure smart governance balances innovation, efficiency, privacy, and citizens' fundamental protections. (Kuner, 2017, p. 89).

4—2. Algorithmic Bias and Digital Inequality

Algorithmic bias challenges smart governance, as algorithms may reflect dataset or programmer biases, reproducing discrimination instead of mitigating it, thus raising ethical concerns for fairness and equity in decision-making processes.

For instance, studies conducted in the United States have demonstrated that certain predictive policing systems exhibit bias against minority groups, as they rely on historical crime data that is often shaped by racially discriminatory policing practices (O’Neil, 2016, p. 105). Similarly, algorithms employed in recruitment processes or credit scoring may systematically disadvantage specific social groups due to pre-existing biases embedded in prior datasets.

From the perspective of digital equality, the reliance of public administration on artificial intelligence risks exacerbating the divide between those who possess digital skills and those who lack them. Citizens with lower levels of education, or those residing in rural areas, may struggle to access digital services or navigate smart platforms—thereby deepening existing inequalities instead of alleviating them (Noble, 2018, p. 74).

Mitigating algorithmic bias demands audits, fairness-oriented design, and transparency, ensuring accountability, equity, and trust, while smart governance must prioritize justice and bridge the digital divide.

4 – 3 – The Challenge of Transparency and Accountability: Who Holds Algorithms Responsible?

The issue of transparency and accountability constitutes one of the most complex ethical challenges in smart governance. Algorithms employed in public administration often operate as a “black box”, making it difficult for citizens—and at times even policymakers—to comprehend their inner workings or discern the criteria underlying their decision-making processes. This opacity raises a fundamental question: **who bears responsibility when errors or injustices arise from automated decisions?**

In numerous cases, algorithms have led to the denial of citizens' rights, such as access to social benefits or eligibility for public sector employment, without any clear pathway for contesting the system or reviewing its determinations. For instance, human rights organizations have documented cases in the Netherlands where authorities deployed algorithms to detect welfare fraud. These systems, however, exhibited bias against migrant communities, culminating in severe social and legal crises (Veale & Edwards, 2018, p. 425).

Algorithmic governance creates an "accountability gap" across developers, administrators, and firms; transparency and the GDPR's "right to explanation" help identify responsibility and protect individuals from automated harms. (Goodman & Flaxman, 2017, p. 27).

Thus, ensuring the success of smart governance necessitates the establishment of clear mechanisms of accountability and transparency. Without such safeguards, algorithms risk shifting from tools intended to enhance efficiency into opaque instruments that perpetuate inequality or enable the evasion of political and legal responsibility.

4 – 4 – The Legal Dimension: The Need for Flexible Digital Legislation

Smart governance demands modern legal frameworks, as traditional laws are ill-suited for big data, AI, and cloud systems. Flexible regulations like the GDPR balance innovation with individual rights. (Kuner, 2017, p. 112).

There is a pressing need for legislation ensuring algorithmic accountability, granting digital decisions legal status with defined rights and obligations. Such laws should safeguard privacy, explanation, and protection from discrimination, while enabling international cooperation in the transnational digital sphere.

In this regard, some strands of the literature propose the adoption of an "**agile regulation**" approach, which entails the progressive development of laws that are subject to periodic revision, as opposed to rigid frameworks that quickly lose their relevance (Calo, 2017, p. 409). Furthermore, the active involvement of technical experts and civil society

actors in the lawmaking process constitutes an essential step to ensure inclusivity, fairness, and social legitimacy.

In sum, the construction of a flexible and adaptive legal framework represents a fundamental prerequisite for achieving balanced smart governance—one that safeguards citizens' fundamental rights while simultaneously enabling technological innovation within public administration.

5 - Prospects of Participatory and Future-Oriented Governance

5 – 1 – The Concept of Participatory Governance in the Digital Age.

Participatory governance in the digital era redefines state–society relations, shifting from vertical authority to interactive models. It fosters trust by embedding transparency, accountability, and equity, positioning citizens as partners in shaping policies and resource allocation.

Looking ahead, emerging technologies such as **Participatory Artificial Intelligence (Participatory AI) and Blockchain** are expected to play a pivotal role in reinforcing the credibility of participatory processes, ensuring the integrity of data, and protecting voting or consultation mechanisms from manipulation. Moreover, the advancement of **interactive platforms** will enable more inclusive mechanisms for engaging marginalized groups—through real-time multilingual translation or simplified tools that address the digital divide.

The future of participatory governance hinges on overcoming key challenges: building advanced legal frameworks for digital rights, fostering citizens' digital competencies, and balancing inclusive participation with efficient decision-making to avoid conflicting interests and inflated demands.

In sum, participatory governance will not merely constitute an optional administrative model but will increasingly become a **prerequisite for the legitimacy of the state in the digital age**. The wider the scope of participation, the deeper the mechanisms of transparency, and

the stronger the frameworks of accountability, the greater the capacity of governments to confront the complex challenges of a rapidly changing world.

5 – 2 - Engaging Citizens through Open Digital Platforms

Open digital platforms foster citizen participation in policymaking by enabling proposals, surveys, and voting. They enhance transparency, accountability, and oversight, while reducing corruption and reinforcing trust between the state and society. (OECD, 2019, p. 43).

Open digital platforms, leveraging open data, promote accountability, transparency, and citizen participation. Their effectiveness depends on supportive culture, resources, and structured procedures for sustainable, responsive governance

5 – 3 - Balancing Technological Innovation and Democratic Accountability

The digital transformation of public administration enhances efficiency via AI and big data but challenges democratic accountability. Without transparent review mechanisms, algorithmic reliance risks reducing clarity, fairness, and citizen trust in governance processes. (Bovens et al., 2014, p. 34).

Smart governance requires a dual framework combining innovation and citizens' rights, through algorithmic standards, audits, explainability, data protection, and inclusive, accountable digital services

5 – 4 - Foresight Vision: Towards a New Administrative and Legal Culture

The foresight vision in smart governance aspires to develop a new administrative and legal culture that can embrace technological innovation while preserving accountability and transparency. At the administrative level, this involves training civil servants to manage digital data, and building institutional capacities for continuous learning and adaptation to rapid changes (Margetts & Dunleavy, 2013, p. 78).

Smart governance demands adaptive legal frameworks ensuring privacy, transparency, participation, and algorithmic accountability, while participatory oversight promotes innovation, efficiency, and democratic legitimacy in addressing digital-era challenges

6. CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates that smart governance constitutes an advanced framework for reshaping public administration in the context of the digital revolution. It provides innovative tools—such as big data, predictive algorithms, and automation—to enhance decision-making effectiveness and public service delivery. However, digital transformation extends beyond technical dimensions, encompassing ethical and legal challenges related to privacy, algorithmic bias, transparency, and accountability. The research also emphasizes the importance of citizen engagement through open digital platforms to foster a participatory and adaptable public administration that balances innovation and efficiency with institutional responsibility and democratic justice

6 – 1 – Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, a set of practical recommendations can be advanced:

- a. Develop flexible and adaptive legal frameworks that safeguard privacy while ensuring transparency and accountability in the use of digital tools.
- b. Strengthen the culture of smart administration among public sector employees through continuous training in artificial intelligence and digital analytics.
- c. Adopt mechanisms for citizen participation in policymaking via open digital platforms to guarantee the integration of societal perspectives into public policies.
- d. Monitor and address algorithmic bias by implementing evaluative and technical standards that ensure fairness and prevent discrimination.
- e. Draw upon leading international experiences to design national strategies that are tailored to local specificities while maximizing the benefits of digital transformation.

Smart governance thus represents a strategic opportunity to rebuild public administration in a balanced and sustainable manner—one that achieves efficiency, innovation, and accountability, while simultaneously strengthening trust between the state and its citizens in the digital age.

7. Bibliography List :

1. Bovens, M., Schillemans, T., & Goodin, R. E. (2014). Public accountability. In M. Bovens, R. E. Goodin, & T. Schillemans (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of public accountability* (pp. 1–26). Oxford University Press.
2. Calo, R. (2017). Artificial intelligence policy: A primer and roadmap. *U.C. Davis Law Review*, 51 (2), 399–435.
3. Dunleavy, P., Margetts, H., Bastow, S., & Tinkler, J. (2006). *Digital era governance: IT corporations, the state, and e-government*. Oxford University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199296194.001.0001>
4. Fung, A. (2006). Varieties of participation in complex governance. *Public Administration Review*, 66 (s1), 66–75. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2006.00667.x>
5. Gil-Garcia, J. R., Zhang, J., & Puron-Cid, G. (2018). Conceptualizing smart governance: A comprehensive framework for the design and assessment of smart initiatives in cities. *Government Information Quarterly*, 35 (2), 162–174.
6. Goodman, B., & Flaxman, S. (2017). European Union regulations on algorithmic decision-making and a “right to explanation.” *AI Magazine*, 38 (3), 50–57.
<https://doi.org/10.1609/aimag.v38i3.2741>
7. Heeks, R. (2001). *Understanding e-governance for development*. Manchester: Institute for Development Policy and Management, University of Manchester.

8. Ho, E. (2018). *Smart Nation: Data, governance and society in Singapore*. Singapore: National University of Singapore Press.
9. Hood, C. (1991). A public management for all seasons? *Public Administration*, 69 (1), 3–19. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9299.1991.tb00779.x>
10. Kitchin, R. (2014). *The data revolution: Big data, open data, data infrastructures and their consequences*. London: SAGE Publications.
11. Kuner, C. (2017). *The General Data Protection Regulation: A commentary*. Oxford University Press.
12. Kuner, C. (2017). *Transborder data flows and data privacy law*. Oxford University Press.
13. Margetts, H., & Dunleavy, P. (2013). The second wave of digital-era governance: A quasi-paradigm for government on the web. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A*, 371 (1987).
14. Margetts, H., & Naumann, A. (2017). Government as a platform: What can Estonia show the world? In A. Brown, R. Kitchin, M. Dodge, & R. Morstyn (Eds.), *Digital government and the platform society* (pp. 115–132). Oxford University Press.
15. Meijer, A. J., & Rodríguez Bolívar, M. P. (2016). Governing the smart city: A review of the literature on smart urban governance. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 82 (2), 392–408.
16. Nam, T., & Pardo, T. A. (2011). Conceptualizing smart city with dimensions of technology, people, and institutions. In *DG.O '11 - Proceedings of the 12th Annual International Digital Government Research Conference* (pp. 282–291). ACM.
<https://doi.org/10.1145/2037556.2037602>
17. Noble, S. U. (2018). *Algorithms of oppression: How search engines reinforce racism*. New York: New York University Press.

18. OECD. (2019). OECD digital government index: 2019 results. OECD Publishing.
<https://doi.org/10.1787/4de9f5bb-en>
19. OECD. (2020). Digital government in the COVID-19 era: Lessons from the Republic of Korea. OECD Publishing.
[<https://doi.org/10.1787/4de2573ben>](<https://doi.org/10.1787/4de2573b-en>)
20. O'Neil, C. (2016). Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy. New York: Crown Publishing Group.
21. Perry, W. L., McInnis, B., Price, C. C., Smith, S. C., & Hollywood, J. S. (2013). Predictive policing: The role of crime forecasting in law enforcement operations. RAND Corporation.
<https://doi.org/10.7249/RR233>
22. Rhodes, R. A. W. (1996). The new governance: Governing without government. *Political Studies*, 44 (4), 652–667.
[<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.14679248.1996.tb01747.x>](<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9248.1996.tb01747.x>)
23. United Nations. (2020). United Nations E-Government survey 2020: Digital government in the decade of action for sustainable development. United Nations.
24. United Arab Emirates Government. (2018). UAE strategy for artificial intelligence 2031.
<https://u.ae>
25. United Arab Emirates Government. (2021). UAE open data portal.
<https://mof.gov.ae/open-data-portal-bayanat-ae>
26. Veale, M., & Edwards, L. (2018). Clarity, surprises, and further questions in the Article 29 Working Party draft guidance on automated decision-making and profiling. *Computer Law & Security Review*, 34 (2), 398–404.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clsr.2017.12.002>
27. World Bank. (1992). Governance and development. World Bank.

28. Zuboff, S. (2019). The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power. New York: PublicAffairs.