Navigating the Maze: AI and Automated Decision-Making Systems in Private International Law

Mukhammad Ali Turdialiev
Tashkent State University of Law
tmuhammadali2020@gmail.com

Abstract

Navigating the intricate landscape of AI and automated decision-making systems within private international law presents both challenges and opportunities. This paper explores the integration of AI technologies in cross-border legal processes, highlighting their potential to enhance efficiency and accuracy. It addresses the legal and ethical implications of using AI in judicial and arbitration settings, including issues of transparency, accountability, and bias. By examining case studies and existing legal frameworks, the research identifies best practices and proposes guidelines for the responsible deployment of AI in private international law. The analysis underscores the need for robust regulatory mechanisms to ensure that AI applications uphold the principles of justice and fairness in an increasingly interconnected world. Ultimately, this study aims to contribute to the development of a coherent legal approach that balances technological innovation with fundamental legal values.

Keywords: AI, Automated Decision-Making, Private International Law, Cross-Border Legal Processes, Legal Ethics, Transparency, Accountability, Choice of law and AI, Judicial Systems, Arbitration

Artificial Intelligence (AI) and automated decision-making systems are rapidly transforming global commerce, communication, and governance. As these technologies transcend national borders, they present unprecedented challenges to established frameworks of private international law. This thesis explores the multifaceted legal issues arising from the intersection of AI, automated decision-making systems, and private international law, offering a critical analysis of current problems and potential solutions. Key areas of focus include:

- Jurisdiction and choice of law in AI-related disputes

- Liability and responsibility for AI decisions

- Data protection and privacy in cross-border AI applications

- Intellectual property rights in AI systems

- Consumer protection in AI-driven commerce

- Employment law implications of AI in an international context[1]

The distributed nature of AI systems complicates traditional notions of jurisdiction due to several factors. One significant challenge is territorial ambiguity, as AI systems often operate in cloud environments, making it difficult to pinpoint a single physical location. Courts are increasingly adopting the effects doctrine, focusing on where the effects of AI's actions are felt rather than where the system is located.[2] Additionally, the concept of virtual presence is gaining traction, suggesting that an AI system can be considered "present" in a jurisdiction if it consistently interacts with users there. A landmark decision by the European Court of Justice in Google LLC v. CNIL (2019) underscored these complexities, ruling that the "right to be forgotten" under EU law does not automatically apply globally. This case highlights the intricate challenges of applying territorial jurisdiction to digital services in an era dominated by AI and cloud computing.[3]

Determining the applicable law for AI-related disputes presents unique challenges, particularly in the localization of the act, the characterization of AI actions, and adopting a data-centric approach. When an AI system operates across multiple jurisdictions, pinpointing where an act or decision occurred becomes complex. The nature of AI decision-making further complicates the characterization of actions, making it difficult to classify them as contractual, tortious, or otherwise. Moreover, some scholars propose a data-centric approach, suggesting that the law of the jurisdiction where the majority of the AI's training data originated should govern. This approach, however, raises additional questions about the relevance and appropriateness of the training data's jurisdiction in determining legal responsibility and the broader implications for cross-border AI operations. Balancing these factors is crucial in developing a coherent legal framework for AI-related disputes.[4]

The autonomous nature of AI systems presents significant challenges to traditional liability frameworks. One major issue is the "Black Box Problem," where the complexity of certain AI systems obscures the decision-making process, complicating the attribution of liability. Additionally, AI systems often involve

---

[1] Ajunwa, I., Crawford, K., & Schultz, J. (2017). Limitless Worker Surveillance. *California Law Review*, 105(3), 735-776.

[2] Cath, C., Wachter, S., Mittelstadt, B., Taddeo, M., & Floridi, L. (2018). Artificial Intelligence and the 'Good Society': The EU, UK, and US Approach. Science and Engineering Ethics, 24(2), 505-528.

[3] European Commission. (2021). Proposal for a Regulation laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act). https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A52021PC0206

[4] Court of Justice of the European Union. (2019). Judgment in Case C-507/17 Google LLC v CNIL. https://curia.europa.eu/jcms/upload/docs/application/pdf/2019-09/cp190112en.pdf

multiple parties, including developers, trainers, and users, further complicating the assignment of liability. In response, some jurisdictions are adopting a risk-based liability approach, assigning responsibility to those best positioned to manage and mitigate the risks associated with AI systems. A notable development in this area is the European Parliament's resolution on the Civil Liability Regime for Artificial Intelligence (2020), which proposes a comprehensive framework for AI liability. This framework includes strict liability for high-risk AI applications, aiming to ensure accountability and promote the safe deployment of AI technologies.[5]

Cross-border data flows integral to AI systems raise significant privacy concerns. Automated decision-making by AI systems can make important decisions about individuals, raising concerns about the necessity of human oversight and the right to explanation. Additionally, data localization requirements in some jurisdictions, which mandate that data be stored within national borders, complicate the operations of global AI systems. Furthermore, obtaining valid consent and ensuring transparency in cross-border AI applications are increasingly challenging tasks. A key regulation in this context is the EU's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), which has global implications for AI systems that process data of EU residents. The GDPR imposes restrictions on automated decision-making and profiling, emphasizing the need for human intervention and accountability. These provisions aim to protect individuals' privacy rights and ensure that AI systems operate transparently and ethically across borders.[6]

Artificial Intelligence (AI) presents significant challenges to traditional intellectual property (IP) concepts. One of the key issues is the role of AI as a creator, which raises questions about the ownership of copyrights for AI-generated works and the eligibility of AI-generated inventions for patents. Additionally, protecting AI algorithms and training data as trade secrets across various jurisdictions has become increasingly complex. Licensing issues also emerge, as the cross-border licensing of AI technologies introduces novel legal questions. A recent case, Thaler v Comptroller General of Patents Trade Marks And Designs [2021] EWCA Civ 1374, saw the UK Court of Appeal uphold that AI systems cannot be named as inventors on patent applications. This decision underscores the ongoing debate surrounding AI and IP rights, highlighting the need for an evolved legal framework to address these modern challenges.

---

[5] Financial Stability Board. (2020). Artificial intelligence and machine learning in financial services. https://www.fsb.org/2020/11/artificial-intelligence-and-machine-learning-in-financial-services/

[6] European Commission. (2021). Proposal for a Regulation laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act). // https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A52021PC0206

AI-driven commerce introduces new challenges for consumer protection across borders. Algorithmic pricing and discrimination can lead to unfair practices, exploiting consumers differently in various jurisdictions. Ensuring transparency in AI usage within consumer transactions becomes complex due to diverse regulatory regimes. Adequate disclosure requirements are essential to maintain trust and fairness. Furthermore, the growing need for efficient online dispute resolution mechanisms is evident, particularly for cross-border e-commerce disputes involving AI. Establishing these mechanisms can help address the unique issues arising from AI's role in commerce, ensuring consumer rights are upheld and fostering trust in digital transactions. Effective international cooperation and harmonized regulations are crucial to tackling these challenges and protecting consumers in the AI-driven marketplace.

The impact of AI on global labor markets presents complex legal issues that require careful consideration. One significant issue is worker classification, particularly within gig economy platforms, where AI-driven processes complicate the determination of worker status across different jurisdictions. This ambiguity challenges existing employment law frameworks and necessitates a reevaluation of classification criteria. Additionally, the rise of algorithmic management, where AI systems oversee and direct worker activities, poses challenges to traditional employment laws designed to protect workers from unfair practices. This new paradigm requires the development of updated legal frameworks that address the unique aspects of AI-driven management. Furthermore, the global deployment of AI underscores the need for innovative approaches to skills development and training.[7]

Different jurisdictions are developing varied approaches to AI regulation. The European Union's Risk-Based Approach, proposed in the AI Act, categorizes AI systems based on risk levels, imposing stricter requirements for high-risk applications. In contrast, the United States has adopted a Sector-Specific Approach, focusing on guidelines tailored to specific industries rather than comprehensive AI legislation. Meanwhile, China's Strategic Approach involves a national strategy aimed at AI leadership, complemented by ethical guidelines. On the international front, cooperation efforts include the OECD AI Principles, which provide guidelines for the responsible stewardship of trustworthy AI, and the UNESCO Recommendation on the Ethics of AI, which serves as a global standard-setting instrument for AI ethics. Additionally, the Global Partnership on AI (GPAI) is an international initiative

---

[7] High-Level Expert Group on AI. (2019). Ethics Guidelines for Trustworthy AI. European Commission. // https://ec.europa.eu/digital-single-market/en/news/ethics-guidelines-trustworthy-ai

dedicated to guiding the responsible development of AI, highlighting the importance of global collaboration in this rapidly advancing field.[8]

Conclusion

The intersection of AI and private international law presents complex challenges that require innovative legal solutions and enhanced international cooperation. Key areas for future development include:

- Development of flexible regulatory frameworks that can adapt to rapid technological change.
- Increased harmonization of AI governance approaches across jurisdictions.
- Enhanced mechanisms for cross-border dispute resolution in AI-related cases.
- Continued evolution of legal and ethical standards in response to AI advancements.

As AI continues to evolve, it is crucial for legal scholars, policymakers, and practitioners to anticipate and address the complex international legal issues that arise. This will require ongoing dialogue, research, and cooperation at the global level to ensure that the benefits of AI can be realized while mitigating potential risks and safeguarding individual rights.

Bibliography

Ajunwa, I., Crawford, K., & Schultz, J. (2017). Limitless Worker Surveillance. *California Law Review*, 105(3), 735-776.

Cath, C., Wachter, S., Mittelstadt, B., Taddeo, M., & Floridi, L. (2018). Artificial Intelligence and the 'Good Society': The EU, UK, and US Approach. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 24(2), 505-528.

Court of Justice of the European Union. (2019). Judgment in Case C-507/17 Google LLC v CNIL.

European Commission. (2021). Proposal for a Regulation laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act).

European Parliament. (2020). Resolution on a Civil liability regime for artificial intelligence (2020/2014(INL)).

Financial Stability Board. (2020). Artificial intelligence and machine learning in financial services.

Gal, M. S., & Elkin-Koren, N. (2017). Algorithmic Consumers. *Harvard Journal of Law & Technology*, 30(2), 309-353.

Global Partnership on AI. (2020). Working Group on Responsible AI. // https://gpai.ai/projects/responsible-ai/

High-Level Expert Group on AI. (2019). Ethics Guidelines for Trustworthy AI. European Commission.

---

[8] UNESCO. (2021). Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence. // https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000380455

https://curia.europa.eu/jcms/upload/docs/application/pdf/2019-09/cp190112en.pdf

https://ec.europa.eu/digital-single-market/en/news/ethics-guidelines-trustworthy-ai

https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A52021PC0206

https://legalinstruments.oecd.org/en/instruments/OECD-LEGAL-0449

https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000380455

https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/TA-9-2020-0276_EN.html

https://www.fsb.org/2020/11/artificial-intelligence-and-machine-learning-in-financial-services/

Jobin, A., Ienca, M., & Vayena, E. (2019). The global landscape of AI ethics guidelines. Nature Machine Intelligence, 1(9), 389-399.

OECD. (2019). Recommendation of the Council on Artificial Intelligence.

Roberts, H., Cowls, J., Morley, J., Taddeo, M., Wang, V., & Floridi, L. (2021). The Chinese approach to artificial intelligence: an analysis of policy, ethics, and regulation. *AI & Society*, 36, 59-77.

Smuha, N. A. (2021). From a 'race to AI' to a 'race to AI regulation': regulatory competition for artificial intelligence. *Law, Innovation and Technology*, 13(1), 57-84.

Thaler v Comptroller General of Patents Trade Marks And Designs [2021] EWCA Civ 1374

UNESCO. (2021). Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence.

Veale, M., & Borgesius, F. Z. (2021). Demystifying the Draft EU Artificial Intelligence Act. *Computer Law Review International*, 22(4), 97-112.

Wachter, S., Mittelstadt, B., & Floridi, L. (2017). Why a Right to Explanation of Automated Decision-Making Does Not Exist in the General Data Protection Regulation. *International Data Privacy Law*, 7(2), 76-99.