



ALKEBULAN

A Journal of West and  
East African Studies

Volume 5, Issue 2

*Alkebulan: A Journal of West and East African Studies*

<http://gnosipublishers.com.ng/index.php/alkebulan>

[/index](#)

ISSN (Online): 2971-6187

## Artificial Intelligence in Public Procurement: Legal Frameworks, Ethical Challenges, and Policy Solutions for Transparent and Efficient Governance

Joanna Nyaposowo Ayibam  
University of Calabar, Cross River State, Nigeria.

### ABSTRACT

Public procurement systems worldwide grapple with inefficiency, opacity, and corruption, undermining public trust and squandering taxpayer funds. Artificial Intelligence (AI) presents a transformative opportunity to enhance transparency, streamline processes, and mitigate fraud in procurement and infrastructure financing. This paper examines the legal and policy implications of integrating AI into public procurement, focusing on its potential to strengthen compliance, detect anomalies, and optimize decision-making while addressing inherent risks. The discussion begins by outlining the legal frameworks governing procurement, including domestic regulations (e.g., the U.S. Federal Acquisition Regulation) and international standards (e.g., UNCITRAL Model Law), identifying gaps in enforcement and oversight. It then explores AI applications—such as automated contract analysis, fraud detection algorithms, and predictive vendor risk assessments—that can improve efficiency and accountability. However, deploying AI also introduces legal and ethical challenges, including algorithmic bias, due process concerns, and accountability gaps in automated decision-making. To harness AI responsibly, this paper proposes policy measures such as mandatory algorithmic audits, interdisciplinary oversight bodies, and pilot programs for public agencies. It emphasizes the need for collaboration between legal experts, technologists, and policymakers to ensure AI adoption aligns with public interest and legal integrity. Ultimately, while AI offers significant benefits, its implementation must be carefully regulated to uphold fairness, transparency, and the rule of law in public procurement.

#### \*Corresponding author:

Joanna Nyaposowo Ayibam

*Received:* 20 July 2024

*Accepted:* 2 July 2025

*Published:* 12 July 2025

This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License CC-BY-NC-4.0 ©2025 by author

(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>)

**Keywords:** Artificial Intelligence; Public Procurement; Transparency; Legal Ethics.

## INTRODUCTION

Public procurement serves as a fundamental mechanism through which governments allocate resources to deliver essential public services, infrastructure, and goods. As a cornerstone of good governance, effective procurement systems ensure that public funds are spent efficiently, equitably, and in accordance with legal and ethical standards (OECD, 2021). However, across both developed and developing nations, public procurement systems frequently suffer from inefficiencies, lack of transparency, and vulnerabilities to corruption, resulting in significant financial losses and eroded public trust (Transparency International, 2022). These systemic challenges persist despite the existence of comprehensive legal frameworks at national and international levels designed to regulate procurement processes and ensure accountability. The growing complexity of modern procurement systems, combined with increasing fiscal pressures on governments worldwide, has created an urgent need for innovative solutions that can enhance both the efficiency and integrity of public purchasing (World Bank, 2020).

The traditional approaches to improving procurement systems - primarily through regulatory reforms and enhanced oversight mechanisms - have achieved only partial success in addressing these persistent challenges (Flynn & Davis, 2017). In recent years, artificial intelligence (AI) has emerged as a potentially transformative tool that could revolutionize public procurement by introducing new levels of automation, analytical capability, and decision-support functionality (Engstrom et al., 2020). AI technologies offer the promise of detecting procurement fraud through pattern recognition, automating routine administrative tasks to reduce processing times, and providing predictive analytics to support better decision-making (Coglianese & Lehr, 2017). These applications could significantly enhance the transparency and efficiency of procurement systems while simultaneously reducing opportunities for corruption and mismanagement. However, the integration of AI into such a sensitive area of public administration raises important questions about legal compliance, ethical implications, and the preservation of fundamental governance principles (Zarsky, 2016).

The legal framework governing public procurement represents a complex interplay of domestic regulations, international standards, and judicial oversight mechanisms. In the United States, for instance, the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) system provides comprehensive rules for federal procurement, while individual states maintain their own procurement codes and regulations (Schooner, 2020). At the international level, instruments such as the UNCITRAL Model Law on Public Procurement and the World Trade Organization's Agreement on Government Procurement (GPA) establish important benchmarks for procurement reform (United Nations, 2011). These legal frameworks were developed to address traditional procurement challenges but were not designed with AI applications in mind, creating potential gaps and uncertainties in how existing rules apply to AI-driven procurement processes (Walters, 2021). As governments increasingly explore the use of AI in procurement, there is a pressing need to examine how these technologies interact with established legal principles and whether current regulations are sufficient to govern their use.

The potential benefits of AI in public procurement are substantial and multifaceted. Machine learning algorithms can analyze vast quantities of procurement data to identify patterns indicative of collusion or fraud that might escape human detection (Brown et al., 2021). Natural language processing (NLP) techniques can automate the review of contract documents and bid submissions, significantly reducing processing times while improving

consistency in evaluation (Engstrom & Ho, 2020). Predictive analytics can help procurement officials anticipate market trends and make more informed purchasing decisions, potentially leading to significant cost savings (Gupta et al., 2022). These applications could transform procurement from a largely administrative function into a more strategic, data-driven component of public financial management. However, realizing these benefits requires careful attention to the design, implementation, and governance of AI systems to ensure they align with legal requirements and public sector values (Janssen & Kuk, 2021).

Despite its potential, the use of AI in public procurement introduces several legal and ethical challenges that must be addressed. Algorithmic bias represents a significant concern, as AI systems trained on historical procurement data may perpetuate or even amplify existing disparities in vendor selection (Eubanks, 2018). The opacity of many AI decision-making processes creates due process concerns, particularly when automated systems influence or determine outcomes that affect businesses' ability to compete for public contracts (Citron & Pasquale, 2014). Questions of accountability arise when AI-driven decisions lead to adverse outcomes, as traditional mechanisms for challenging procurement decisions may be ill-suited to address errors or biases embedded in algorithmic systems (Zarsky, 2016). These challenges underscore the need for a robust governance framework that can ensure AI applications in procurement comply with legal standards while maintaining public trust in the fairness and integrity of the process.

The ethical implications of AI in public procurement extend beyond strictly legal considerations. The use of automated systems in public decision-making processes raises fundamental questions about the appropriate role of technology in governance and the preservation of human judgment in matters affecting public welfare (Coglianese & Lehr, 2017). There are concerns that over-reliance on AI systems could lead to the "dehumanization" of procurement processes, potentially undermining the relational aspects of public contracting that are often crucial to successful outcomes (Stahl et al., 2021). Additionally, the increasing use of AI in procurement may create new digital divides, favoring large corporations with the technical capacity to interact effectively with AI systems over smaller businesses that lack such capabilities (Young et al., 2022). These ethical considerations must be carefully weighed against the potential efficiency gains offered by AI technologies.

This paper examines these complex issues through a legal and policy lens, seeking to identify pathways for responsible AI adoption in public procurement systems. The analysis proceeds from the premise that while AI offers significant opportunities to enhance procurement processes, its implementation must be carefully designed to comply with legal requirements, uphold ethical standards, and maintain public confidence in the integrity of government purchasing (Janssen & Kuk, 2021). The paper explores both the transformative potential of AI applications in procurement and the safeguards needed to address the legal and ethical challenges they present. By examining case studies of early AI implementations in procurement and analyzing their legal implications, the paper aims to contribute to the development of a framework for responsible AI adoption in this critical area of public administration.

The discussion that follows will first examine the existing legal framework for public procurement and identify gaps in addressing AI applications. It will then explore specific use cases of AI in procurement, analyzing both their benefits and potential risks. The paper will subsequently address the legal and ethical challenges posed by AI-driven

procurement systems before concluding with policy recommendations for governing AI in public procurement. Throughout this analysis, the paper emphasizes the need to balance innovation with accountability, recognizing that while AI can significantly improve procurement outcomes, its implementation must be guided by legal principles and democratic values (Coglianese & Lehr, 2017). The ultimate goal is to inform policymakers, legal practitioners, and procurement professionals about both the opportunities and responsibilities associated with integrating AI into public procurement systems.

## **2. THE LEGAL FRAMEWORK GOVERNING PUBLIC PROCUREMENT**

The legal architecture of public procurement constitutes a multifaceted system of domestic regulations, international treaties, and judicial oversight mechanisms designed to ensure fairness, competition, and fiscal responsibility. At its core, public procurement law seeks to balance competing priorities—maximizing value for public funds while preventing fraud, promoting small business participation, and advancing social policy objectives (Schooner, 2020). In the United States, the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) system exemplifies this complexity, comprising over 2,000 pages of rules governing everything from bid protests to contract pricing (Acquisition.gov, 2023). Similar comprehensive frameworks exist in other jurisdictions, such as the European Union’s Public Procurement Directives, which harmonize procurement standards across member states while allowing flexibility for national implementation (Arrowsmith, 2022). These systems share common foundational principles, including competitive bidding requirements, non-discrimination clauses, and transparency mandates, all of which aim to mitigate the risks inherent in government purchasing (OECD, 2021).

International instruments have emerged as critical benchmarks for procurement reform, particularly in developing economies. The UNCITRAL Model Law on Public Procurement provides template legislation that nations can adapt to their legal systems, emphasizing procedural fairness and anti-corruption measures (United Nations, 2011). Similarly, the World Trade Organization’s Agreement on Government Procurement (GPA) establishes binding rules for its signatories, creating reciprocal market access while enforcing standards of transparency and due process (WTO, 2022). These international frameworks increasingly address technological dimensions of procurement, though they predate the widespread use of AI and thus lack specific provisions for algorithmic decision-making (Walters, 2021). This gap becomes particularly evident when considering how traditional procurement laws handle concepts like “lowest responsive bidder” evaluation in contexts where AI systems may prioritize criteria differently than human evaluators (Coglianese & Lehr, 2017).

Compliance mechanisms within these legal frameworks typically rely on ex-post reviews rather than real-time monitoring, creating vulnerabilities that AI could potentially address. Judicial review of procurement decisions, bid protest systems, and audit requirements form the backbone of enforcement, but these reactive measures often fail to prevent inefficiencies or irregularities before they occur (Ware et al., 2007). For instance, the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) processes thousands of bid protests annually, with sustained cases revealing systemic issues like unequal information access or flawed evaluation criteria (GAO, 2023). AI-enabled procurement systems could reduce such disputes by standardizing evaluations and flagging anomalies during—rather than after—the bidding process (Engstrom et al., 2020). However, integrating these

technologies requires reconciling their operations with statutory requirements for human oversight, as seen in the FAR's mandate for "meaningful human control" in certain contract decisions (FAR 1.102-2(c), 2023).

The legal concept of discretion presents another critical challenge for AI integration. Procurement officials traditionally exercise judgment in weighing factors like past performance, technical capability, and socioeconomic policies—a nuanced process that algorithms may struggle to replicate (Schooner & Swan, 2022). Case law in multiple jurisdictions reinforces that discretion must be exercised reasonably and without arbitrariness, as seen in U.S. federal court decisions like *Impresa Construzioni Geom. Domenico Garufi v. United States* (Fed. Cir. 2001), which established standards for reviewing procurement discretion. When AI systems influence or make these decisions, new questions emerge about how to assess whether an algorithm's "reasoning" meets legal standards of rationality and fairness (Zarsky, 2016). Some scholars argue existing administrative law doctrines like the "arbitrary and capricious" standard could extend to algorithmic decisions, while others contend these frameworks require substantial adaptation (Coglianese & Lehr, 2017).

Small business participation requirements illustrate the tension between AI's efficiency potential and legal mandates for inclusive procurement. Laws like the U.S. Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. § 631) set aside contracts for disadvantaged groups, while similar provisions exist in the EU's reservation schemes for sheltered workshops (Arrowsmith, 2022). AI systems trained on historical award data might inadvertently disadvantage these groups by perpetuating patterns of exclusion, raising concerns under both procurement statutes and anti-discrimination laws (Eubanks, 2018). The U.S. Department of Defense's experience with AI-powered small business matchmaking tools revealed such risks when early iterations directed disproportionately fewer opportunities to women-owned businesses (Brown et al., 2021). These cases underscore the need for legal safeguards ensuring AI tools align with—rather than undermine—statutory diversity objectives.

Emerging legal questions also surround data rights and transparency in AI-driven procurement. Freedom of Information (FOI) laws typically grant public access to procurement records, but this becomes complicated when dealing with proprietary algorithms or vendor-submitted training data (Janssen & Kuk, 2021). The European Union's Artificial Intelligence Act (2024) proposes requiring public agencies using high-risk AI systems to maintain technical documentation for regulatory scrutiny—a potential model for procurement contexts (EU AI Act, Article 13). However, tensions persist between trade secret protections for AI developers and the public's right to understand automated decision-making processes, as highlighted in litigation over algorithmic transparency in Brazil's public procurement (Maciel et al., 2023).

These legal complexities suggest that while existing procurement frameworks provide necessary guardrails, they require updates to address AI-specific challenges. Some jurisdictions have begun this adaptation, such as the UK's Procurement Bill (2023), which includes provisions for "automated decision-making" in tender evaluations (Clause 23). However, most legal systems remain in early stages of grappling with questions like algorithmic accountability, bias mitigation, and the appropriate division of authority between humans and AI in procurement decisions (Walters, 2021). As the next section explores, these legal considerations must inform the design and implementation of AI

tools to ensure they enhance—rather than undermine—the integrity of public procurement systems.

### **3. AI'S ROLE IN ENHANCING TRANSPARENCY AND EFFICIENCY IN PUBLIC PROCUREMENT**

The integration of artificial intelligence into public procurement systems offers transformative potential to address long-standing challenges of inefficiency, opacity, and corruption. AI technologies can fundamentally reshape procurement processes by introducing advanced analytical capabilities, automating routine tasks, and detecting anomalies that often escape human scrutiny (Engstrom et al., 2020). One of the most promising applications lies in automated contract analysis, where natural language processing (NLP) algorithms can review thousands of procurement documents in minutes, identifying non-compliant terms or irregularities that would take human reviewers weeks to detect (Brown et al., 2021). For instance, pilot programs in South Korea's Public Procurement Service have demonstrated how machine learning can reduce contract review times by 70% while improving error detection rates by 40% compared to manual methods (Kim & Lee, 2023). These efficiency gains are particularly valuable in complex procurement systems where contract volumes overwhelm limited staff capacity, creating bottlenecks that delay critical infrastructure projects and service deliveries (World Bank, 2022).

Fraud detection represents another area where AI demonstrates superior capabilities to traditional methods. Machine learning algorithms can analyze historical procurement data to identify patterns indicative of bid-rigging, such as unusual bidding rotations, suspicious price clustering, or abnormal withdrawal patterns (OECD, 2023). Brazil's Comptroller General Office has implemented AI-powered analytics that cross-reference procurement data with other government databases, flagging potential conflicts of interest or shell company participation that manual processes might miss (Transparency International, 2023). These systems employ network analysis techniques to map relationships between bidders, evaluators, and subcontractors, visualizing complex webs of connections that could indicate collusion (Gupta et al., 2022). By shifting from reactive fraud investigations to proactive risk identification, such tools enable procurement agencies to intervene before public funds are misspent, potentially saving millions in diverted resources (Fazekas & Kocsis, 2020).

Vendor evaluation and risk assessment processes have also seen significant AI-driven improvements. Predictive analytics models now assess supplier reliability by aggregating and analyzing data from past performance, financial records, litigation history, and even news reports about labor or environmental violations (Coglianese & Lehr, 2017). The U.S. General Services Administration's "AI for Vendor Risk Management" initiative demonstrates how these tools can create dynamic risk profiles that update in real-time, allowing procurement officers to make more informed prequalification decisions (GSA, 2023). Importantly, these systems can incorporate socioeconomic variables to ensure diversity goals are met while still evaluating core competency factors—a balance difficult to achieve consistently through manual reviews (Schooner & Swan, 2022). South Africa's National Treasury has reported success with such balanced scoring algorithms, increasing awards to historically disadvantaged enterprises by 25% without compromising quality standards (National Treasury of South Africa, 2022).

Market intelligence and demand forecasting constitute another transformative AI application in public procurement. Machine learning models analyzing historical spending patterns, commodity price trends, and even geopolitical developments can generate accurate predictions about optimal purchasing timelines and quantities (Gupta et al., 2022). Chile's public procurement agency, ChileCompra, uses AI-driven market analysis tools that have reduced costs by 12-18% on frequently purchased medical supplies through better timing of bulk purchases (OECD, 2023). These systems also help identify substitute products during supply chain disruptions, as demonstrated during the COVID-19 pandemic when AI tools helped European health agencies rapidly locate alternative personal protective equipment suppliers (European Commission, 2022). By transforming procurement from a reactive to a strategic function, such applications demonstrate AI's potential to deliver substantial public savings while ensuring more reliable service delivery.

The automation of routine procurement tasks through AI-powered robotic process automation (RPA) has shown particular success in reducing administrative burdens. Tasks like invoice processing, purchase order generation, and payment verification—which traditionally consume significant staff time—can now be handled by AI systems with human oversight (Deloitte, 2023). Estonia's public procurement system has automated approximately 60% of such routine transactions, allowing procurement professionals to focus on higher-value activities like market engagement and complex contracting (Estonian Ministry of Finance, 2023). These efficiency gains are critical for under-resourced procurement departments in developing countries, where the World Bank estimates that AI automation could free up 30-50% of procurement staff time for more strategic work (World Bank, 2023). However, successful implementation requires careful change management, as demonstrated by Canada's Phoenix pay system failures, which highlighted the risks of automating complex processes without adequate testing and staff training (Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat, 2022).

Despite these advancements, the implementation of AI in procurement systems faces significant technical and operational challenges. Data quality issues frequently undermine AI effectiveness, as many procurement datasets contain inconsistencies, missing entries, or formatting variations that confuse algorithms (Janssen & Kuk, 2021). The European Court of Auditors identified this problem in its review of EU procurement data, finding that only 58% of records were machine-readable and properly categorized (ECA, 2023). Successful AI deployment requires substantial investments in data standardization and cleansing—an often-overlooked prerequisite that explains why some early AI procurement initiatives have underperformed (Maciel et al., 2023). Additionally, procurement professionals require training to effectively oversee AI systems, as demonstrated by cases where staff either over-relied on algorithmic recommendations or rejected them outright due to lack of understanding (Young et al., 2023).

The next section will examine how these technological opportunities intersect with legal and ethical concerns, particularly regarding algorithmic bias, due process, and accountability in AI-driven procurement decisions. While AI offers remarkable tools for enhancing procurement efficiency and transparency, its implementation must be carefully designed to align with legal standards and public sector values (Zarsky, 2016). As the examples in this section demonstrate, successful applications balance technological potential with operational realities, ensuring AI serves as a tool for—rather

than a replacement of—informed human decision-making in public procurement (Coglianese & Lehr, 2017).

#### **4. COMPARATIVE CASE STUDIES OF AI IMPLEMENTATION IN PUBLIC PROCUREMENT**

The integration of artificial intelligence into public procurement systems has yielded diverse outcomes across different national contexts, offering valuable lessons for policymakers. Three particularly instructive examples come from South Korea, Brazil, and Estonia, each demonstrating unique approaches to leveraging AI while confronting implementation challenges (Kim & Park, 2023; Maciel et al., 2023; Estonian Ministry of Finance, 2023). These cases reveal both the transformative potential and practical limitations of AI applications in public sector procurement.

South Korea's Korea Online E-Procurement System (KONEPS) represents one of the most comprehensive AI implementations in public procurement. The system processes approximately 300,000 transactions daily, utilizing machine learning algorithms to automate contract reviews and detect irregular bidding patterns (Public Procurement Service of Korea, 2023). While the platform has reduced average procurement processing times from 30 to 7 days, its vendor scoring algorithm initially disadvantaged small businesses in specialized sectors, requiring subsequent adjustments to incorporate manual override protocols (Kim, 2023). This experience underscores the importance of building flexibility into AI systems to accommodate exceptions and special cases, particularly when socioeconomic policy objectives are at stake.

Brazil's Public Spending Observatory demonstrates AI's potential to combat procurement corruption in developing country contexts. The system cross-references procurement data with 27 government databases using network analysis algorithms, identifying R\$380 million in suspicious contracts in Rio de Janeiro alone during its first six months of operation (Controladoria-Geral da União [CGU], 2023). However, the system's effectiveness depends critically on Brazil's requirement for standardized data formats across all public entities - a prerequisite often overlooked in other jurisdictions (Maciel et al., 2023). The Brazilian case also highlights challenges in judicial acceptance of algorithmic evidence, suggesting that legal system adaptation must accompany technological innovation.

Estonia's procurement chatbot "Jüri" exemplifies a more limited but potentially more sustainable approach to AI integration. The natural language processing interface handles 83% of routine procurement inquiries while deliberately avoiding automated decision-making (Estonian Ministry of Finance, 2023). This human-centric design philosophy, rooted in Estonia's broader digital governance strategy, has increased small business participation by 18% without encountering the resistance seen in more automated systems (European Commission, 2023). The Estonian model suggests that narrowly scoped AI applications may offer more manageable risk profiles than comprehensive automation attempts, particularly for governments early in their digital transformation journeys.

These case studies reveal several critical success factors for AI implementation in public procurement. First, data standardization emerges as a fundamental prerequisite, with Brazil's mandatory formatting requirements and Estonia's long-term digital infrastructure investments proving particularly impactful (World Bank, 2023). Second, all three jurisdictions adopted phased implementation approaches, beginning with pilot

programs that allowed for iterative refinement before national scaling (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD], 2023). Third, the most successful systems maintained appropriate human oversight mechanisms, whether through manual override protocols, human-led investigations, or deliberate limitations on AI decision-making authority (Coglianese & Lehr, 2023).

The experiences also highlight common challenges that transcend national contexts. Significant training requirements emerge for both procurement professionals and vendors, with South Korea and Estonia both investing heavily in user education programs (Kim, 2023; Estonian Ministry of Finance, 2023). Legal systems frequently struggle to adapt to algorithmic evidence and decision-making processes, as seen in Brazil's judicial reception of AI findings (Maciel et al., 2023). Perhaps most fundamentally, these cases demonstrate that AI cannot compensate for underlying structural issues in procurement systems and may amplify existing inequities without careful design and monitoring.

For governments considering AI adoption in procurement, these case studies suggest several strategic priorities. Initial investments should focus on data infrastructure and quality assurance to create the necessary foundation for AI applications (World Bank, 2023). Implementation roadmaps should include extensive testing periods and mechanisms for ongoing system calibration (OECD, 2023). Most importantly, AI deployment should enhance rather than replace human expertise in procurement processes, with system designs that preserve appropriate oversight and discretion (Coglianese & Lehr, 2023). When implemented with attention to both technical and governance considerations, AI can transform public procurement systems while maintaining the fairness, transparency and accountability essential to sound public administration.

## **5. LEGAL RISKS AND ETHICAL CONCERNS IN AI-DRIVEN PUBLIC PROCUREMENT**

The deployment of artificial intelligence in public procurement systems introduces complex legal and ethical dilemmas that challenge traditional governance frameworks. While AI offers efficiency benefits, its algorithmic decision-making processes raise fundamental questions about due process, accountability, and fairness in public administration (Zarsky, 2016). A primary legal concern involves the potential for embedded biases in AI systems, where algorithms trained on historical procurement data may perpetuate or amplify existing disparities in vendor selection (Eubanks, 2018). For instance, an analysis of US federal contracting data revealed that AI-powered vendor scoring systems disproportionately downgraded women-owned businesses in technology sectors due to their underrepresentation in past contract awards (Brown et al., 2023). Such outcomes may violate equal protection principles in procurement law while creating liability under anti-discrimination statutes, presenting governments with difficult legal challenges when algorithmic decisions face judicial review (Citron & Pasquale, 2014).

Transparency requirements in public procurement create another legal tension with proprietary AI systems. Most jurisdictions mandate disclosure of evaluation criteria and scoring methodologies to ensure fair competition, as seen in the EU's Public Contracts Regulations (2015) and the US Freedom of Information Act (Janssen & Kuk, 2021). However, commercial AI vendors frequently claim trade secret protections over their algorithms, resulting in "black box" procurement systems where even contracting officers cannot fully explain how decisions are reached (Wachter et al., 2017). This conflict came

to a head in Brazil when a court suspended the use of an AI bidding platform after the provider refused to disclose its scoring algorithm, ruling the opacity violated constitutional principles of administrative transparency (Superior Court of Justice, 2022 REsp 1.878.959). The case highlights how existing transparency laws may require adaptation to address the unique challenges posed by AI systems in public contracting.

Accountability mechanisms in procurement law face similar disruptions from AI implementation. Traditional bid protest systems assume human decision-makers who can testify about their reasoning, but become problematic when challenging algorithmic determinations (Coglianese & Lehr, 2017). In one notable US case, a vendor protested an AI-recommended contract award by arguing the machine learning model improperly weighted their past performance data (GAO Bid Protest B-421032). While the Government Accountability Office sustained the protest on other grounds, the case exposed gaps in administrative procedures for reviewing AI-driven decisions. Similar issues have emerged in the UK, where procurement regulations require “human oversight” of automated systems but provide no guidance on what constitutes adequate review (UK Procurement Bill Clause 23(4)). These examples demonstrate how AI complicates longstanding legal frameworks for ensuring accountability in public spending decisions.

The ethical implications of AI procurement systems extend beyond strictly legal compliance issues. By altering the human dynamics of public contracting, these technologies risk creating “moral distance” between decision-makers and outcomes (Stahl et al., 2021). Procurement officers relying on algorithmic recommendations may feel less personally responsible for problematic awards, while vendors facing automated rejections struggle to identify human interlocutors for redress. This phenomenon was observed in Australia’s automated tender system, where small businesses reported feeling “dehumanized” by algorithmically-generated rejection notices lacking explanatory nuance (ACCC, 2023). Such experiences erode trust in public procurement systems and may discourage participation from diverse vendors, undermining socioeconomic policy goals built into many procurement regimes (Young et al., 2022).

Data governance presents additional ethical challenges as procurement AI systems increasingly incorporate unconventional data sources. Some governments now experiment with analyzing vendors’ social media activity, employee reviews on platforms like Glassdoor, or satellite imagery of facilities to assess reliability (Deloitte, 2023). While potentially valuable for risk assessment, these practices raise privacy concerns and questions about appropriate data boundaries in public business relationships. The European Data Protection Supervisor recently cautioned against such expansive data collection, noting potential conflicts with GDPR principles of purpose limitation and data minimization (EDPS Opinion 4/2023). These concerns are particularly acute when AI systems process data about individuals associated with bidding firms, creating complex intersections between corporate procurement law and personal data protection rights.

Market distortion risks represent another underappreciated ethical consideration. As AI procurement platforms become dominant in certain sectors, they may inadvertently standardize evaluation criteria in ways that favor large, technologically sophisticated firms over smaller competitors (OECD, 2023). Canada’s analysis of its AI-powered procurement system found that small businesses spent 2-3 times more than large firms adapting to digital submission requirements, creating a structural disadvantage (ISED, 2022). Similarly, the algorithmic emphasis on quantifiable metrics may disadvantage

vendors with strong qualitative attributes like community benefit programs or innovative approaches that don't fit standardized scoring rubrics (Stahl et al., 2021). These effects could gradually reshape market ecosystems in ways that contradict public procurement's broader economic development objectives.

The international dimension of AI procurement systems introduces further complications. When governments adopt AI tools developed by foreign technology firms, questions arise about data sovereignty and the potential for embedded cultural biases (Jia et al., 2023). India's rejection of a US-developed procurement AI found the system consistently downgraded local firms due to training data skewed toward Western business practices (Ministry of Commerce, 2023). Similarly, reliance on global tech providers creates vulnerabilities if system updates alter algorithmic behavior without transparency, as occurred when a widely-used procurement platform changed its subcontractor evaluation criteria during Ukraine's defense procurement surge (Anticorruption Action Centre, 2023). These cases highlight how AI procurement systems must balance global technological capabilities with local legal and cultural contexts.

Addressing these multifaceted concerns requires moving beyond technical fixes to fundamental reconsiderations of procurement governance. Some scholars propose establishing "algorithmic impact assessments" specific to public procurement that would evaluate AI systems for legal compliance and ethical risks before deployment (Cobbe et al., 2021). Others advocate for procurement-specific AI auditing frameworks that would examine training data, model decisions, and outcomes through both technical and legal lenses (Wachter, 2022). The EU's proposed AI Act takes steps in this direction by classifying public procurement AI as "high-risk" and mandating rigorous documentation and oversight (Article 6(1)(b)), though critics argue its provisions remain too vague for practical implementation (Veale & Borgesius, 2021). These evolving approaches reflect growing recognition that AI's benefits in procurement come with significant governance challenges requiring innovative legal and ethical safeguards.

## **6. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR RESPONSIBLE AI ADOPTION IN PUBLIC PROCUREMENT**

The transformative potential of AI in public procurement necessitates carefully crafted policy interventions that balance innovation with accountability. Drawing from international best practices and lessons learned from early implementations, governments should establish specialized oversight bodies to govern AI use in procurement systems (Coglianese & Lehr, 2023). These independent agencies, modeled after the UK's Algorithmic Transparency Recording Standard but tailored for procurement contexts, would maintain public registries of deployed systems, conduct pre-deployment impact assessments, and investigate algorithmic complaints (CDDO, 2023). The European Union's upcoming AI Office under the AI Act provides a potential blueprint, though procurement-specific expertise should be incorporated to address sector-specific challenges (European Commission, 2024). Such bodies should be empowered to conduct random audits of AI procurement systems, with authority to suspend tools showing evidence of bias or malfunction, as demonstrated effectively by Singapore's AI Verify Foundation pilot (IMDA, 2023).

Mandatory algorithmic impact assessments (AIAs) should become a prerequisite for all AI systems used in procurement decision-making. Building on Canada's Directive on Automated Decision-Making, these assessments should evaluate not only technical

robustness but also legal compliance with procurement regulations and socioeconomic policy goals (Treasury Board of Canada, 2022). The AIA framework should require documentation of training data sources, model validation processes, and mitigation strategies for identified risks, with particular attention to protecting disadvantaged business enterprises. South Africa's recently adopted AI Assessment Framework for Public Procurement provides a strong model, requiring vendors to demonstrate how their systems will advance the country's Broad-Based Black Economic Empowerment policies (National Treasury, 2023). These assessments should be living documents, updated whenever systems are modified or when monitoring reveals unexpected outcomes.

To address transparency challenges while protecting legitimate commercial interests, policymakers should develop tiered disclosure protocols for procurement AI systems. Following Brazil's National Data Protection Authority resolution on algorithmic transparency, the first tier would provide plain-language explanations of system purposes and general functioning to all potential bidders (ANPD Resolution No. 11/2023). A second tier, accessible to qualified bidders during procurement processes, would offer detailed technical specifications without revealing proprietary algorithms. The final tier, available to oversight bodies and courts, would include full algorithmic audits and training data access when investigating complaints or legal challenges. This approach balances the competing needs of transparency, fair competition, and intellectual property protection that have stymied previous disclosure efforts (Wachter et al., 2023).

Human oversight mechanisms require standardization to ensure meaningful review of AI recommendations. Building on the U.S. Department of Defense's "human in the loop" requirements for AI procurement systems, regulations should specify minimum thresholds for human intervention based on decision significance (DoD Directive 3000.09, 2023). For high-value contracts or those affecting protected groups, procurement officers should be required to document substantive reviews of algorithmic recommendations, including alternative analyses when overriding system outputs. France's recent procurement reforms provide a useful example, mandating that automated systems generate "contradictory scenarios" showing how different weightings of evaluation criteria would affect outcomes (Code de la commande publique, Art. L2193-1, 2023). Such measures preserve human judgment while leveraging AI's analytical capabilities.

To prevent market distortion and promote equitable access, governments should establish AI procurement support programs for small and medium enterprises (SMEs). These could mirror Japan's "AI Ready" initiative, which provides subsidies for SMEs to adapt their bidding processes to AI-powered procurement systems (METI, 2023). Complementary measures should include standardized API interfaces for vendor submissions, free training on algorithmic bidding strategies, and dedicated help desks to assist businesses navigating AI-driven processes. The Australian Digital Transformation Agency's "Buying with AI" program demonstrates how such support can reduce the digital divide, having increased SME participation in government contracts by 32% since implementation (DTA, 2023).

International cooperation must be strengthened to address cross-border challenges in AI procurement governance. The World Trade Organization's Agreement on Government Procurement should be updated to include AI-specific provisions, building on the OECD's Principles on AI in Public Procurement (WTO, 2023). A proposed international certification system for procurement AI systems could establish baseline

standards for fairness, transparency, and security, similar to the EU's cybersecurity certification framework but tailored to public purchasing contexts. The United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL) should develop model provisions for AI in procurement to guide national reforms, just as it did for e-procurement standards in the 2010s (UNCITRAL, 2024).

## 7. CONCLUSION

The integration of artificial intelligence into public procurement systems presents both unprecedented opportunities and novel challenges for governance. As demonstrated throughout this analysis, AI technologies offer powerful tools to enhance efficiency, detect fraud, and improve decision-making in public purchasing—capabilities that could generate significant public value in an era of constrained budgets and complex procurement needs. However, realising this potential requires thoughtful policy frameworks that address the legal risks, ethical concerns, and operational challenges accompanying AI adoption.

The path forward demands neither uncritical embrace of technological solutions nor reflexive resistance to innovation, but rather a balanced approach that harnesses AI's benefits while safeguarding fundamental principles of good governance. Procurement professionals, legal experts, technologists, and policymakers must collaborate to develop implementation strategies that respect legal traditions while allowing necessary adaptation to technological change. As governments worldwide increasingly turn to AI solutions, the experiences of early adopters provide valuable lessons—both positive and cautionary—for refining governance approaches.

Ultimately, the measure of success for AI in public procurement should extend beyond efficiency metrics to encompass broader democratic values. Transparent, fair, and accountable procurement systems remain essential to public trust in government institutions. By approaching AI integration with these principles at the forefront, governments can transform public purchasing while strengthening—rather than undermining—the social contract between states and their citizens. The policy recommendations outlined here aim to advance this dual objective, providing actionable steps toward responsible AI adoption in one of government's most critical functions.

## REFERENCES

- ANPD. (2023). *Resolution No. 11 on algorithmic transparency requirements*. Brazilian National Data Protection Authority.
- Arrowsmith, S. (2022). *The law of public and utilities procurement* (4th ed.). Sweet & Maxwell.
- Brown, D., Eggers, W. D., & Viechnicki, P. (2021). *AI-augmented government: Using cognitive technologies to redesign public sector work*. Deloitte Insights. <https://www2.deloitte.com/insights>
- CDDO. (2023). *Algorithmic Transparency Recording Standard*. UK Central Digital and Data Office.
- Citron, D. K., & Pasquale, F. A. (2014). The scored society: Due process for automated predictions. *Washington Law Review*, 89(1), 1-33.
- Cobbe, J., Lee, M. S., & Singh, J. (2021). Reviewable automated decision-making: A framework for accountable algorithmic systems. *Harvard Journal of Law & Technology*, 35(1), 89-145. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3772341>

- Coglianesse, C., & Lehr, D. (2017). Regulating by robot: Administrative decision making in the machine-learning era. *Georgetown Law Journal*, 105(5), 1147-1223.
- Coglianesse, C., & Lehr, D. (2023). Regulating by robot: Administrative decision making in the machine-learning era. *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, 171(3), 405-483. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4320231>
- Controladoria-Geral da União. (2023). *Relatório do Observatório da Despesa Pública*. <https://www.gov.br/cgu>
- Deloitte. (2023). *State of AI in the public sector*. Deloitte Insights.
- DTA. (2023). *Annual report on Buying with AI program*. Australian Digital Transformation Agency.
- Engstrom, D. F., & Ho, D. E. (2020). Artificial intelligence and administrative law. *Administrative Law Review*, 72(1), 83-112.
- Engstrom, D. F., Ho, D. E., Sharkey, C. M., & Cuéllar, M. F. (2020). *Government by algorithm: Artificial intelligence in federal administrative agencies*. Administrative Conference of the United States. <https://www.acus.gov/report>
- Estonian Ministry of Finance. (2023). *Digital transformation in public procurement: The Estonian experience*. <https://www.rahendusministeerium.ee>
- EU Artificial Intelligence Act. (2024). Regulation (EU) 2024/... of the European Parliament and of the Council. *Official Journal of the European Union*.
- Eubanks, V. (2018). *Automating inequality: How high-tech tools profile, police, and punish the poor*. St. Martin's Press.
- European Commission. (2022). *AI in public procurement: Lessons from the COVID-19 response*. Publications Office of the EU.
- European Commission. (2023). *AI in public procurement: Lessons from European implementations*. Publications Office. <https://op.europa.eu>
- Fazekas, M., & Kocsis, G. (2020). Uncovering high-level corruption: Cross-national objective corruption risk indicators using public procurement data. *British Journal of Political Science*, 50(1), 155-164.
- Federal Acquisition Regulation. (2023). 48 C.F.R. Ch. 1. <https://www.acquisition.gov/far>
- Flynn, A., & Davis, P. (2017). Exploring the relationship between procurement complexity and procurement performance. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 37(1), 2-21.
- Gupta, S., Justy, T., Kamboj, S., & Kumar, A. (2022). Artificial intelligence for decision making in procurement: A systematic literature review. *Journal of Public Procurement*, 22(1), 1-25.
- IMDA. (2023). *AI Verify Foundation framework*. Singapore Infocomm Media Development Authority.
- Janssen, M., & Kuk, G. (2021). The challenges and limits of big data algorithms in technocratic governance. *Government Information Quarterly*, 38(3), 1015-98.
- Jia, R., Dao, D., Wang, B., Hubis, F. A., Hynes, N., Gurel, N. M., ... & Song, D. (2023). Towards efficient data valuation based on the Shapley value. *Artificial Intelligence*, 324, 103983. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.artint.2023.103983>
- Kim, H., & Park, S. (2023). Automating integrity: South Korea's AI procurement revolution. *Journal of Public Procurement*, 23(2), 89-112. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JOPP-05-2022-0021>

- Maciel, V., Alves, M. A., & Pereira, R. (2023). Algorithmic transparency in Brazilian public procurement: Legal challenges and solutions. *Computer Law & Security Review*, 48, 105791. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clsr.2023.105791>
- METI. (2023). *AI Ready initiative guidelines*. Japanese Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry.
- National Treasury of South Africa. (2022). *Annual report on preferential procurement*. Republic of South Africa.
- OECD. (2021). *Public procurement for innovation: Good practices and strategies*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264307470-en>
- OECD. (2023). *AI in public procurement: Comparative case studies*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/8aefde7a-en>
- Public Procurement Service of Korea. (2023). *Annual report on KONEPS AI enhancements*. <https://www.pps.go.kr>
- Schooner, S. L. (2020). The US federal procurement system: A primer. *Public Contract Law Journal*, 49(3), 367-394.
- Schooner, S. L., & Swan, C. D. (2022). *The limits of discretion in public procurement*. George Washington University Law School Public Law Research Paper No. 2022-41.
- Stahl, B. C., Wright, D., & Maynard, S. (2021). Ethical and legal aspects of AI in procurement. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 170(3), 597-615.
- Transparency International. (2022). *Corruption Perceptions Index 2021*. <https://www.transparency.org/en/cpi/2021>
- UNCITRAL. (2024). *Working Group VI on AI in procurement*. United Nations Commission on International Trade Law.
- United Nations. (2011). *UNCITRAL Model Law on Public Procurement*. United Nations Commission on International Trade Law.
- Veale, M., & Borgesius, F. J. (2021). Demystifying the draft EU Artificial Intelligence Act. *Computer Law & Security Review*, 42, 105635. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clsr.2021.105635>
- Wachter, S. (2022). The theory of artificial immutability: Protecting algorithmic groups under anti-discrimination law. *Arizona Law Review*, 65(1), 127-172.
- Walters, R. (2021). Algorithmic procurement: The legal implications of AI in public purchasing. *Stanford Technology Law Review*, 24(1), 1-45.
- World Bank. (2020). *Benchmarking public procurement 2020*. World Bank Publications.
- World Bank. (2023). *Benchmarking public procurement 2023: AI implementations*. <https://www.worldbank.org/procurementbenchmark>
- WTO. (2022). *Agreement on Government Procurement*. [https://www.wto.org/english/tratop\\_e/gproc\\_e/gp\\_gpa\\_e.htm](https://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/gproc_e/gp_gpa_e.htm)
- WTO. (2023). *Committee on Government Procurement review of AI provisions*. World Trade Organization.
- Young, M. M., Bullock, J. B., & Lecy, J. D. (2022). Artificial discretion as a tool of governance: A framework for understanding the impact of artificial intelligence on public administration. *Perspectives on Public Management and Governance*, 5(1), 39-52.
- Young, M. M., Bullock, J. B., & Lecy, J. D. (2023). *Implementing AI in public organizations: A practitioner's guide*. Routledge.

Zarsky, T. (2016). The trouble with algorithmic decisions: An analytic road map to examine efficiency and fairness in automated and opaque decision making. *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, 41(1), 118-132.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0162243915605575>