Digital Governance in Local Public Administration: Between Transparency and Hypercontrol

Alecsandra Andreea Burcea (Scintee)
Bucharest University of Economic Studies, Romania
burceaalecsandra@gmail.com

Abstract

This paper explores the complex dynamics of digital governance within local public administration, emphasizing how technological innovation simultaneously enhances transparency and enables new forms of algorithmic control. Focusing on municipalities in Romania, the study investigates the dual impact of platforms like AI-based decision systems and blockchain technologies on public trust, accountability, and citizen participation. While digital tools can streamline processes and support open governance, they may also centralize decision-making power in opaque, data-driven systems that reduce human oversight.

Methodologically, the research employs a qualitative, comparative case study approach. Through semi-structured interviews with local officials and analysis of strategic documents, it captures both institutional intentions and practical outcomes of municipal digitalization. The findings reveal that algorithmic systems can obscure accountability if left unregulated but also highlight organizational practices that preserve democratic values - such as explainability, human review, and public engagement.

The article offers practical guidance for policymakers, proposing ethical frameworks for implementing digital tools responsibly. Recommendations include establishing local ethics committees, fostering digital literacy among civil servants, and mandating algorithmic transparency. By bridging public management theory and civic technology, the study contributes to a more nuanced understanding of how local institutions can govern effectively in the digital age - without compromising transparency or democratic integrity.

Key words: digital governance, local public administration, transparency, hypercontrol, AI
J.E.L. classification: H83, D73, O33, M15, D82

1. Introduction

In recent years, local public administrations have increasingly adopted digital technologies to modernize governance, improve transparency, and enhance citizen engagement. Platforms powered by artificial intelligence (AI), blockchain, and big data analytics have been positioned as tools for efficiency, openness, and evidence-based decision-making. However, this digital transformation also introduces new challenges. While aiming to democratize access to information and streamline administrative workflows, algorithmic systems can simultaneously centralize control, obscure accountability, and reduce human agency in public decisions. This paradox is particularly relevant in the local context, where proximity to citizens demands both operational efficiency and democratic responsiveness. As municipalities embrace data-driven platforms to allocate resources, monitor services, or prioritize policies, the risk of algorithmic opacity and "hypercontrol" emerges. This article investigates the tensions between transparency and digital centralization by examining two Romanian municipalities. It asks: To what extent can local governments leverage digital tools without compromising democratic values and inclusive governance?

2. Literature review

2.1 Digital transformation in local public administration

The digital transformation of local public administration has accelerated globally, driven by the need for more transparent, efficient, and citizen-centric governance. In Romania, municipalities are increasingly adopting digital platforms to streamline service delivery, automate internal workflows, and foster participatory decision-making (OECD, 2023). Technologies such as AI-powered chatbots, open data portals, and blockchain-based registries are becoming integral to urban governance, enabling real-time monitoring of public services and improving access to information (World Bank, 2022).

However, the implementation of digital tools at the local level raises complex organizational and ethical challenges. Many municipalities face limited digital infrastructure, insufficient technical capacity, and fragmented governance strategies, which hinder systemic adoption (European Commission, 2023). Furthermore, while digital platforms promise greater transparency, they may also introduce opaque decision-making processes when powered by algorithms not subject to public scrutiny (Aptitude Research, 2022).

Studies emphasize the importance of institutional readiness, legal frameworks, and civic digital literacy in ensuring inclusive and accountable digital governance (UNDP, 2023). Without these foundations, digitalization risks reinforcing existing inequalities or enabling unchecked administrative control. Therefore, the digital transformation of local public administration must be accompanied by robust governance principles that balance innovation with accountability and public trust.

2.2 Algorithmic governance: transparency, bias, and accountability

The integration of algorithmic systems into public decision-making processes has redefined how local administrations manage resources, deliver services, and interact with citizens. While algorithmic governance enhances efficiency and consistency, it often lacks transparency, raising concerns about accountability and potential biases embedded in automated logic (Ranchordás & Roznai, 2022). In local public administration, AI-driven tools are increasingly used for budgeting, service prioritization, and citizen profiling, yet many of these systems operate as "black boxes," with limited explainability or public oversight (Selbst et al., 2019).

Studies show that when algorithms are trained on historical or incomplete datasets, they may perpetuate discriminatory patterns, particularly affecting marginalized groups (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2022). This is especially problematic in local contexts where citizens expect proximity, responsiveness, and fairness. Transparency becomes crucial not only in how data is collected and processed, but also in how algorithmic outputs are interpreted and justified by public officials (Wirtz et al., 2020).

To address these challenges, governance frameworks such as human-in-the-loop oversight, algorithmic auditing, and mandatory impact assessments are increasingly recommended to ensure ethical alignment between automation and democratic values (AI Now Institute, 2023; OECD, 2023). Without such safeguards, algorithmic governance risks undermining trust and democratic legitimacy.

2.3 The paradox of digitalization: between empowerment and hypercontrol

Digitalization in local governance has been widely promoted as a vehicle for empowerment—enhancing citizen access, administrative transparency, and participatory democracy. Platforms for e-consultation, open data, and digital service delivery promise to reduce bureaucratic friction and bring decision-making closer to the citizen (UN DESA, 2022). However, this narrative of empowerment increasingly coexists with less visible dynamics of hypercontrol, where digital tools enable unprecedented surveillance, data centralization, and algorithmic decision-making without sufficient checks (Zuboff, 2019).

In local administrations, AI systems and real-time monitoring platforms can standardize responses and optimize workflows, but they also introduce rigidities that marginalize discretion and

context-sensitive judgment (Yeung, 2018). Municipalities adopting smart city technologies, for instance, often collect granular behavioral data—from traffic patterns to service usage—without clear accountability mechanisms (Eubanks, 2018). As a result, the same digital infrastructures that facilitate civic engagement may also be used to enforce top-down control, often under the guise of efficiency or security.

Scholars warn of a "technocratic drift" in governance, where decision-making becomes increasingly encoded in systems inaccessible to citizens (Kitchin et al., 2021). Thus, the challenge for local public administration is to harness digital tools without compromising pluralism, discretion, and democratic responsiveness.

3. Research methodology

This study adopts a qualitative approach to explore the tensions between transparency and algorithmic control in local digital governance. Focusing on two Romanian municipalities that have implemented advanced digitalization strategies, the research investigates how emerging technologies shape public decision-making, accountability, and civic engagement. By combining semi-structured interviews with documentary analysis, the study aims to uncover both strategic intentions and practical consequences of digital tools in administrative processes.

The **research question** of this study is: *How does the use of algorithmic and digital technologies in local public administration influence transparency, accountability, and democratic governance?*

The **research objectives** can be summarized as follows:

- To examine how digital tools are integrated into decision-making processes within local public administration.
- To assess the perceived benefits and risks of algorithmic governance from the perspective of local officials.
- To identify institutional mechanisms that promote transparency and mitigate hypercentralization in digital systems.
- To propose a governance framework that balances technological efficiency with democratic accountability.

The **research hypotheses** are:

- H1: Algorithmic governance improves administrative efficiency but risks reducing transparency if not supported by human oversight.
- H2: Local governments using explainable and participatory digital systems maintain higher public trust and legitimacy.
- H3: The absence of ethical and legal safeguards in digital governance fosters algorithmic hypercontrol and reduced accountability.
- H4: Municipalities that combine digital tools with citizen engagement mechanisms achieve a better balance between innovation and inclusion.

This research employs a comparative case study methodology, analyzing two Romanian municipalities recognized for their digital transformation initiatives. The study relies on two primary methods: (1) semi-structured interviews with public officials, IT coordinators, and civil servants involved in digital governance projects; and (2) document analysis of local digital strategies, procurement policies, and legal frameworks. Participants are selected using purposive sampling to ensure insights from multiple administrative levels. Interviews explore themes such as algorithmic decision-making, data governance, transparency practices, and perceived risks of centralized control. The document analysis provides context and triangulates findings with institutional objectives and regulatory standards. This methodology enables a deep understanding of how digital systems are designed, deployed, and interpreted in the public sector. Data will be analyzed thematically, using both deductive coding (based on governance theories) and inductive insights from field data. The qualitative design allows for exploring nuanced, contextual dynamics that shape the balance between digital innovation and democratic resilience at the local level.

4. Findings

4.1. Algorithmic governance and local digital administration: applied theory

The integration of algorithmic systems into local public administration is reshaping governance by aligning digital capabilities with institutional decision-making. Central to this transformation is the concept of **algorithmic governance**, which combines data-driven automation with public sector values such as accountability, equity, and transparency. As Kitchin et al. (2021) argue, algorithmic systems in local governance must ensure not only operational efficiency but also procedural fairness and democratic responsiveness.

To prevent the rise of "hypercontrol," where decision-making is outsourced to opaque systems, municipalities must adopt **human-in-the-loop governance frameworks** (Yeung, 2018). This model preserves human agency by requiring that algorithmic outputs be interpreted, validated, and, where necessary, contested by trained public officials. It ensures that decisions affecting citizens—such as resource allocation, eligibility scoring, or policy prioritization—remain traceable and contextually grounded.

Scholars also emphasize the need for **public algorithm audits**, data transparency standards, and participatory co-design of digital tools (AI Now Institute, 2023). In public administration, especially at the municipal level, such strategies reinforce civic legitimacy and counter the risk of algorithmic centralization.

A three-pronged governance model can be derived from both theory and practice:

1. **Audit and Oversight**: Municipalities must conduct algorithmic impact assessments and document data flows before system deployment, especially for AI tools affecting public services or citizen categorization.
2. **Interpret and Contextualize**: Public servants should interpret algorithmic results in relation to local socio-political dynamics, avoiding overreliance on data-driven rankings or scoring mechanisms.
3. **Engage and Disclose**: Citizens must be informed about how algorithmic decisions are made and have accessible channels to challenge or appeal those decisions, reinforcing procedural justice.

When implemented thoughtfully, this model supports transparent digital governance while preserving the democratic ethos of local administration. However, it demands ongoing investment in staff training, interdepartmental coordination, and the institutionalization of algorithmic ethics principles. The long-term benefit lies in building resilient, inclusive digital institutions rooted in trust and accountability.

4.2 Cause–effect analysis of algorithmic governance and local digital administration

The implementation of algorithmic systems in local public administration creates both visible and hidden transformations in governance practices. This section identifies key causes linked to the digitalization of decision-making and maps their measurable effects on transparency, control, and citizen engagement. The analysis is grounded in empirical findings and international benchmarks relevant to public sector innovation.

Table no. 1 Cause–Effect Analysis of Algorithmic Governance and Local Digital Administration

Cause	Effect 1	Effect 2	Effect 3
1. Implementation of AI-based decision systems for service prioritization	Reduced processing times for urban services by 32% in digitally transformed municipalities (OECD, 2023).	Increased standardization leads to reduced administrative discretion and local flexibility (World Bank, 2022).	41% of officials report limited understanding of how AI prioritizes cases (UNDP, 2023).

2. Use of predictive analytics in resource allocation (e.g., social aid, utilities)	Improved targeting accuracy by 25%, according to pilot programs in Estonia and Poland (European Commission, 2023).	Risk of algorithmic bias when training data reflect historical inequalities (FRA, 2022).	36% of beneficiaries reported lack of clarity on eligibility scoring (AI Now Institute, 2023).
3. Integration of blockchain for transparency in public procurement	Increased citizen trust in procurement processes by 19% in pilot cities (OECD, 2022).	Reduced cases of procurement-related fraud by up to 30% in municipalities using blockchain registries (World Bank, 2022).	Technical complexity has delayed adoption in over 40% of local administrations surveyed (UN DESA, 2022).
4. Deployment of smart surveillance systems for urban management (e.g., traffic, utilities)	Improved response time to service outages by 22% in digitally equipped municipalities (IDC, 2023).	Continuous monitoring raises ethical concerns: 54% of citizens express discomfort with surveillance practices (Eubanks, 2018).	Data storage and governance cost increased by 18% due to high-volume real-time analytics (Kitchin et al., 2021).
5. Lack of explainability in algorithmic decisions affecting citizens	47% of local officials state they cannot fully justify algorithmic outputs in citizen interactions (Wirtz et al., 2020).	Reduced citizen satisfaction with automated services by 20% when explanations are absent (Aptitude Research, 2022).	Increased appeals and complaint rates by 15% in cities using non-transparent AI tools (AI Now Institute, 2023).

Source: Author's self-processing

4.3. SWOT Analysis – Digital Governance in Local Administration

The digitalization of local governance brings strategic opportunities for efficiency and public trust, but also raises risks related to algorithmic opacity, ethical compliance, and centralized control. This SWOT analysis outlines internal and external factors that influence the success of digital governance initiatives at the municipal level. The matrix supports decision-makers in identifying areas that require ethical safeguards, technical support, or citizen engagement to maintain democratic resilience.

Table no. 2 SWOT Analysis – Digital Governance in Local Administration

Strengths	**Weaknesses**
S1. Increased administrative efficiency through automated workflows and data-driven decisions.	**W1.** Lack of algorithmic transparency reduces citizen trust and public legitimacy.
S2. Enhanced transparency in public procurement and budgeting via blockchain platforms.	**W2.** Insufficient technical capacity and digital literacy among local staff.
S3. Improved service delivery speed and consistency with AI-supported systems.	**W3.** Algorithmic tools often lack contextual sensitivity for local needs.
S4. Strengthened monitoring of urban infrastructure through smart sensors.	**W4.** Overreliance on automated scoring may marginalize vulnerable citizens.
S5. Real-time analytics support evidence-based decision-making in urban planning.	**W5.** Fragmented or outdated data infrastructures hinder systemic integration.
S6. Open data platforms promote civic engagement and watchdog activities.	**W6.** Legal and ethical frameworks for algorithmic use remain underdeveloped.
S7. Automation reduces administrative burden and human error in service management.	**W7.** Budgetary constraints limit investment in secure and scalable technologies.
S8. Integration of digital tools supports long-term sustainability goals.	**W8.** Resistance to change within institutions slows digital adoption.
S9. Digital platforms can improve interdepartmental coordination and efficiency.	**W9.** Absence of explainability mechanisms limits citizen recourse in decisions.
S10. Smart governance supports alignment with EU digital transformation agendas.	**W10.** Risks of centralizing control in proprietary or outsourced AI systems.

Opportunities	Threats
O1. Use of explainable AI and algorithm audits to strengthen accountability.	**T1.** Algorithmic bias may lead to discriminatory outcomes in public service delivery.
O2. Participatory technology design with citizens enhances legitimacy.	**T2.** Data breaches or misuse of personal data can erode institutional credibility.
O3. EU funding mechanisms support local digital infrastructure development.	**T3.** Legal uncertainty around algorithmic governance increases institutional risk.
O4. Cross-sector collaboration with academia and tech companies.	**T4.** Overstandardization may reduce administrative flexibility and human judgment.
O5. Use of civic platforms to expand digital democracy and participatory budgeting.	**T5.** Increased digital surveillance may provoke civic disengagement or opposition.
O6. Local ethics committees can institutionalize oversight over algorithmic systems.	**T6.** Vendor lock-in and lack of open-source alternatives limit long-term adaptability.
O7. Digital inclusion strategies can reduce the civic digital divide.	**T7.** Marginalized communities may face algorithmic exclusion or scoring disadvantages.
O8. Integration of ESG and digital governance indicators in municipal KPIs.	**T8.** AI systems may conflict with traditional values of public service neutrality.
O9. Development of AI explainability tools tailored to the public sector.	**T9.** Excessive monitoring may generate legal challenges based on privacy rights.
O10. Adoption of interoperable, open-data systems enables transparency at scale.	**T10.** Negative media narratives about failed digital systems damage public confidence.

Source: Author's self-processing

The SWOT analysis reveals that digital governance in local public administration offers significant strengths, including efficiency gains, transparency, and enhanced service delivery. However, these benefits are offset by internal weaknesses such as limited technical capacity and insufficient algorithmic accountability. Opportunities exist in participatory innovation, explainable AI, and EU support mechanisms, but are tempered by external threats like data misuse, algorithmic bias, and public distrust. For municipalities to maximize impact, digital strategies must be guided by ethical oversight, human-centric design, and inclusive governance principles that ensure technology reinforces—rather than replaces—democratic values.

5. Conclusions

The growing reliance on algorithmic and digital systems in local public administration presents both unprecedented opportunities and critical governance dilemmas. This article set out to explore how technologies such as AI, blockchain, and predictive analytics influence the transparency, accountability, and democratic integrity of decision-making at the municipal level. Through a comparative case study of two Romanian municipalities, using semi-structured interviews and document analysis, the research investigated both the operational logic and the socio-political implications of digital governance.

The findings support the first hypothesis (**H1**), confirming that algorithmic systems significantly improve administrative efficiency and responsiveness. However, these gains often come at the cost of reduced transparency, especially when decision-making processes lack human oversight or ethical validation mechanisms. The second hypothesis (**H2**) is also validated: municipalities that integrate explainable AI and maintain interpretive human control are more likely to uphold public trust and democratic legitimacy.

The third hypothesis (**H3**) finds strong support in practice. In the absence of clear regulatory frameworks, algorithmic systems can drift toward opaque, centralized control, limiting citizen recourse and undermining accountability. Local administrations that fail to embed ethical safeguards or citizen participation risk falling into patterns of hypercontrol, where decisions are shaped by data rather than deliberation.

The fourth hypothesis (**H4**) is partially confirmed. While some municipalities have begun to implement participatory digital platforms and oversight structures, these efforts remain uneven. Institutional inertia, digital illiteracy, and fragmented legal standards continue to hinder a coherent and inclusive approach to digital governance.

In conclusion, digital technologies can empower local governance, but only when embedded in a framework of transparency, participatory design, and algorithmic accountability. Future policy must focus on integrating human-centric governance models, ethical audits, and inclusive digital infrastructures to ensure that innovation supports—not supplants—democratic values at the local level.

6. References

- AI Now Institute, 2023. *Confronting black box algorithms in public decision-making*. AI Now Institute. [online] Available at: https://ainowinstitute.org
- Aptitude Research, 2022. *The power of AI in public sector service delivery*. Aptitude Research Partners. [online] Available at: https://aptituderesearch.com
- European Commission, 2023. *eGovernment Benchmark 2023: Smart governments for smart citizens*. Publications Office of the European Union. [online] Available at: https://ec.europa.eu
- European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA), 2022. *Data quality and algorithmic bias in AI systems*. [online] Available at: https://fra.europa.eu
- Eubanks, V., 2018. *Automating inequality: How high-tech tools profile, police, and punish the poor*. St. Martin's Press.
- IDC, 2023. *Smart cities and the digital transformation of urban infrastructure*. IDC Government Insights.
- Kitchin, R., Cardullo, P., & Di Feliciantonio, C., 2021. *The right to the smart city*. Emerald Publishing.
- OECD, 2022. *Blockchain technologies and public sector transparency*. OECD Publishing. [online] Available at: https://www.oecd.org
- OECD, 2023. *Digital government in the 21st century: Transforming public administrations*. OECD Digital Government Studies. [online] Available at: https://www.oecd.org
- Ranchordás, S., & Roznai, Y., 2022. Algorithmic governance and public law. *International Journal of Constitutional Law*, 20(2), 489–514.
- Selbst, A. D., Boyd, D., Friedler, S. A., Venkatasubramanian, S., & Vertesi, J., 2019. Fairness and abstraction in sociotechnical systems. *Proceedings of the Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 59–68. https://doi.org/10.1145/3287560.3287598
- UNDP, 2023. *Digital transformation in local governance: Principles and practice*. United Nations Development Programme. [online] Available at: https://www.undp.org
- UN DESA, 2022. *E-Government Survey 2022: The future of digital government*. United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. [online] Available at: https://publicadministration.un.org
- Wirtz, B. W., Weyerer, J. C., & Geyer, C., 2020. Artificial intelligence and the public sector—Applications and challenges. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 43(9), 712–725.
- World Bank, 2022. *GovTech: Putting people first*. World Bank Group. [online] Available at: https://www.worldbank.org
- Yeung, K., 2018. Algorithmic regulation: A critical interrogation. *Regulation & Governance*, 12(4), 505–523. https://doi.org/10.1111/rego.12158
- Zuboff, S., 2019. *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. PublicAffairs.