ISSN: 3080-9843 (Print), ISSN: 3080-9851 (Online)

Discussion on Implementation Path of Algorithm Governance in Audit Work

Weiyi Li

Business School, University of Auckland, Auckland, 1010, New Zealand

Abstract

At present, the application of algorithms in the decision-making process of enterprises has gradually expanded and changed audit work. Rule-based and machine-learning models have been used to address financial risk scoring, compliance monitoring and fraud detection, and as a result, new governance problems for the audit profession have arisen, such as technical opacity, accountability gaps and changing regulatory requirements. This paper studies the implementation paths of algorithm governance in audit systems, derives theoretical support from research on algorithmic accountability, and examines top-level governance standards as practical references. The five main implementation directions of the analysis are: algorithmic inventory and risk classification; model transparency and explainability protocols; bias detection and fairness validation; continuous monitoring and trigger-based Audit coverage; and organizational capacity building. In short, the paper suggests that to achieve effective algorithm governance in an auditing environment, a hybrid architecture is required, integrating technical controls, institutional accountability mechanisms and competency-oriented human supervision; together, these should ensure that algorithmic decisions are auditable, contestable and consistent with the professional standards for independent assurance.

Keywords

Algorithm Governance, Audit Framework, Algorithmic Accountability, AI Risk Management, Internal Audit, Transparency, Explainability.

1. Introduction

Historically, the three attributes of an audit profession have been independence, a basis in evidence, and professional scepticism. The above basic ideas were created for a world where people in charge of an organization had to make all the choices. Algorithmic systems have begun to emerge, such as rule-based expert systems and adaptive machine-learning models; they have altered this situation. At present, algorithms are employed to make or support the decision-making process for credit approval, tax compliance scoring, employee performance assessment and procurement risk assessment. Due to the scale and speed of the decisions, the old audit methods are no longer suitable.

The reasons for the current problems in audit practice are not complex algorithms, but structural opacity. Unlike the thinking process of a person, which can be questioned and recorded, the reasoning path of a deep-learning model is spread across billions of numerical parameters and cannot be intuitively understood. There is no disclosure of the reasons for the accounting changes that the audit cannot examine. If the algorithm systematically assigns a higher risk score to transactions involving certain demographic groups, or if the model's prediction changes over time due to economic fluctuations, neither the auditee nor the auditor will be able to detect such problems through a standard audit of the financial statements.

ISSN: 3080-9843 (Print), ISSN: 3080-9851 (Online)

Algorithm governance is a set of organizations that have responded to this problem. Policies, processes and technical controls that organizations have built to provide oversight, accountability and remediation capabilities for algorithmic systems in their governance structure. The two applications of algorithm governance in the audit function are to assess the quality of clients' algorithm governance systems and to apply governance principles to the use of AI-powered audit tools by auditors themselves.

This paper offers an analytical system for studying and applying algorithm governance in audit work. Section 2 introduces the theoretical and legal foundations for algorithmic accountability. Section 3 presents the particular governance problems in algorithmic audit environments. Section 4 shows the main implementation paths for embedding algorithm governance in the audit life cycle. Section 5 presents the organization and institutional prerequisites for long-term governance capacity. Section 6 is the conclusion and policy recommendations.

2. Theoretical and Regulatory Foundations

In terms of theory, the foundation of algorithm governance can be traced back to the integration of law, computer science and organization theory. Pasquale [1] first proposed a comprehensive analysis of the system risks in opaque algorithms for finance and information. His first idea is that secret algorithms leading to important decisions may harm accountability, fairness and the public's trust in democracy, so scholars have started to study this problem. The idea of a 'black box' entered popular governance discussion through this work, and it came to signify the state where the logic of automated decision-making is unavailable to the people it affects.

Kroll and others [2] have built upon this to demonstrate that algorithmic accountability can be achieved without disclosing all the details of a private model. Using cryptography and formal verification, it has been shown that the procedural regularity of an algorithm's decision-making process—whether a fair, public rule has been consistently applied to all cases—can be verified without disclosing trade secrets. This can be directly applied to audit practice: in an algorithmic environment, the audit object is not to reverse-engineer model parameters but to confirm whether the stated decision rules have been consistently and non-discriminatorily implemented. Procedural accountability and full transparency are distinct, and thus, they do not require the same audit scope.

The European parliament research service [3] at the policy level has collected existing governance proposals to put forward a multi-level system of prohibitions on high-risk applications, mandatory impact assessments, independent audit requirements, and rights of contestation. The framework has provided support for the next round of regulations in Europe and abroad. Parallel work by the open government partnership [4] has shown that effective algorithmic accountability in the public sector requires not only technical mechanisms but also binding legal frameworks, institutional incentive structures and civil society oversight capacity.

The release of the NIST AI risk management framework [5] has provided institutional support for translating the above theoretical commitments into practice. The four components of the NIST framework for algorithmic risk management are: govern, map, measure and manage; they provide an organizational system of language and processes to implement oversight at all times in the life cycle of an AI system. Therefore, to ensure the trustworthiness of artificial intelligence systems, a combination of accuracy, consistency, safety, security, transparency and fairness must be achieved; thus, the standard system for algorithmic governance has been established.

3. Governance Challenges in Algorithmic Audit Environments

The particular governance problems that have appeared in the environment for algorithmic audits can be divided into three categories: technical, institutional and professional. At the

ISSN: 3080-9843 (Print), ISSN: 3080-9851 (Online)

technical level, the opacity of black-box machine learning models poses a basic problem of evidence. In accordance with audit standards, draw audit conclusions on the basis of reasonable and sufficient evidence, and document the procedures for obtaining this evidence so that an experienced independent practitioner can understand them. Where the inferential logic of an algorithm is not understandable even to its developers, these documentation requirements cannot be met by conventional means.

Goodman and Tréhu [6] have examined the present situation of algorithmic audit requirements in the leading legal systems and found that the demands put forward by the draft and enacted laws often exceed the actual capacity of available audit methods. Provide for the auditor to certify that the algorithm will produce non-discriminatory results; for example, assume a standard definition of fairness that is still under discussion in the technical community and a validated method for detecting disparate impact at scale. Goodman refers to this discrepancy between legal expectations and the actual results of audit practice as 'accountability theatre': governance procedures that meet the formal requirements for compliance but do not provide genuine assurance.

The AI now institute [10] added to this institutional criticism by stating that audit-centred accountability systems are inadequate if the auditing institutions themselves lack independence, technical ability or enforcement powers. The efficacy of algorithmic governance is determined by the structural integrity of the oversight system; an audit conducted by an institution financially linked to the audited party and employing methods developed by the model developer offers little substantive accountability. Based on the above observations, the design requirements for algorithm governance in the audit department are clear: independence, professional competence and methodological rigor must be guaranteed by institutions, not just claimed.

4. Implementation Pathways for Algorithm Governance

Algorithm governance principles need to be transformed into operating audit procedures, and a system for their all-encompassing application is required. The first is all-encompassing inventory and risk classification. Before governance controls can be implemented, the audit team needs to build an all-encompassing register of the algorithmic systems operating in the scope of the audit, including both formally approved systems and informally developed shadow deployments by business units. Given their probable impact on the financial statements and other factors, classify all systems reasonably. ISACA [7] has set up an AI algorithm audit system to examine governance structures, control design, data quality, model behavior, outputs and risks at various links of AI application.

The second form of realization is model transparency and interpretability. Audit governance should be able to trace back the reasons for an algorithm's decision to specific input data and inference processes. Traceability in rule-based systems is provided by the documented decision logic of the system. Machine learning models also require interpretability; therefore, special explanation technologies need to be developed for them, such as feature importance analysis, counterfactual explanations and local model approximations. Arrieta et al. [8] believe that the choice of an explanation method needs to be suitable for the particular structure of a model and the specific governance issues that need to be addressed; different methods show different parts of a model's behaviour.

Bias detection and fairness validation are the third implementation pillars. Algorithmic systems trained on historical data inherit and may amplify biases in the data; as a result, different demographic groups receive unequal treatment. Bias may take the form of different risk scores assigned to different segments of the client base in the audit, or failure to flag certain transactions for manual review. Deloitte [9] has recommended adding risk assessment, control

ISSN: 3080-9843 (Print), ISSN: 3080-9851 (Online)

testing and continuous monitoring to the governance of AI for internal audits. The above operations should be performed before deploying the model and periodically during the model's operation in the system.

The fourth way is continuous monitoring and trigger-based audit coverage. Fixed-interval annual audit cycles are structurally unsuitable for algorithmic systems that exhibit changing risk profiles due to factors such as data drift, model updates or alterations in the operating environment. Ernst & Young [11] proposed that the internal audit department prepares AI-driven audit plans, alerts the audit team to AI risks, and adds AI governance to the existing assurance system. Thus, the audit resources will be more appropriately deployed to focus on periods with higher algorithmic risks in the audit work, rather than being evenly spread throughout the audit period.

5. Organizational Preconditions and Institutional Capacity

The construction of algorithm governance in the audit department cannot rely on the establishment of rules alone; organizational capacity building must be carried out simultaneously. The traditional competency model of audit professionals focuses on accounting standards, internal control assessment and professional scepticism, etc., but is no longer suitable for algorithmic governance work. To regulate AI systems better, some additional strengths in data science, statistical inference, principles of software engineering and the concept of machine learning risk management are needed. Therefore, the audit department needs to adjust its talent recruitment and professional training plans to cultivate all-around talents with cross-disciplinary knowledge that can address the current expertise deficiency.

The design of governance documents and reporting norms is also a problem for the organization. Good algorithm governance is not a one-time compliance activity, but rather an continuous, iterative process of adjusting risk assessment, control design and monitoring. Audit functions need to develop documentation templates and reporting forms that can record changes in the risk characteristics of algorithmic systems, document not only point-in-time control evaluations but also the trajectory of model performance over time, triggers for increased scrutiny, and remedial measures taken in response to identified deficiencies. Without the discipline of longitudinal documentation, the audit record will only show individual audits rather than continuous monitoring of algorithmic risk management.

Involve the public and other groups in building an algorithm-governance system. Algorithmic accountability cannot be achieved through technical means alone; people who have been affected by an algorithm should be able to know about it, question it and appeal against it. An all-encompassing governance system will include a right of appeal against decisions made by algorithms, in addition to transparency, independent supervision and impact evaluation. Therefore, in terms of auditing, the engagement team should consider both the technical efficiency of the algorithm's controls and how much the governance structure enables access to explanations of the algorithm and what remedies are available for those affected by it. Governance arrangements that do not have these contestation mechanisms fail to meet the substantive requirements of algorithmic accountability, regardless of their technical sophistication.

Lastly, the institution shall ensure the independence of the algorithmic governance function. Structural independence is necessary for credible assurance, and governance arrangements that make the responsible party for assessing algorithmic systems also responsible for their development or commercial application cannot ensure reliable accountability. The organization of the audit function should have separate teams responsible for developing and applying algorithmic tools, as well as for assessing the governance of these tools. When the algorithm audit process itself is conducted by AI, these tools should meet the same governance requirements as client systems; they need to be independently verified by non-client staff and maintain records that can support regulatory inspection and professional accountability.

Development of algorithm governance standards in all regions will also require close cooperation between the internal audit department and the external regulatory authority. Given the new legal provisions in the EU (AI Act) and other regions that require algorithmic impact assessments and audit disclosure, organizations need to show that their internal governance systems can meet these external demands. The internal audit function is situated at this junction of organizational practice and regulatory expectations, and it will be responsible for ensuring the practical effectiveness and external verifiability of the algorithmic governance system. Construction of institutional connections, reporting systems and technical language required to realize the bridging function should be given due attention by the profession.

6. Conclusion

The addition of algorithm systems in decision-making by organizations is now one of the most substantial changes to the working environment of modern audit. Based on the above analysis, effective governance of algorithms in audit work should be built on a multi-dimensional implementation platform that includes inventory and risk classification, model transparency, bias detection, continuous monitoring, and organizational capacity building. Each dimension corresponds to a particular level of the accountability problem caused by opaque, adaptive, and high-consequence algorithmic systems.

Based on the analysis of the theoretical and regulatory systems in this paper, algorithmic accountability needs to be both technically feasible and institutionally supported. Tools for technical explanations and statistical test methods provide support for the governance conclusion, but they are only effective in institutional systems that ensure the independence, competence and enforcement power of these tools. Although excellent audit work will not compensate for a lack of a division of responsibilities and appeal rights within the system of governance, it cannot be ignored either.

Therefore, practitioners and policymakers need to add algorithm governance to the core standards of audit and should not treat it as an isolated or special-case application. As algorithmic systems are increasingly used to handle financial information and compliance in China, so too has the quality of audit work been changing. Therefore, auditors now need to evaluate the risks introduced by these systems and provide corresponding audit assurances to support good governance. The implementation paths provided in this paper will offer a reference for practitioners to address the problem in an organized, reasonable and logical manner.

References

[1] Pasquale, F. (2015). The black box society: The secret algorithms that control money and information. Harvard University Press.

[2] Kroll, J. A., Huey, J., Barocas, S., Felten, E. W., Reidenberg, J. R., Robinson, D. G., & Yu, H. (2017). Accountable algorithms. University of Pennsylvania Law Review, 165(3), 633–705. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2941859

[3] European Parliamentary Research Service. (2019). A governance framework for algorithmic accountability and transparency. European Parliament.

[4] Open Government Partnership, Ada Lovelace Institute, & AI Now Institute. (2021). Algorithmic accountability for the public sector. Open Government Partnership.

[5] National Institute of Standards and Technology. (2023). Artificial intelligence risk management framework (AI RMF 1.0). NIST.

ISSN: 3080-9843 (Print), ISSN: 3080-9851 (Online)

[6] Goodman, E. P., & Tréhu, J. (2023). Algorithmic auditing: Chasing AI accountability. Santa Clara High Technology Law Journal, 39(3), 289–338. https://doi.org/xxxx

[7] ISACA. (2024). AI algorithm audits: Key control considerations. ISACA.

[8] Arrieta, A. B., Díaz-Rodríguez, N., Del Ser, J., Bennetot, A., Tabik, S., Barbado, A., García, S., Gil-López, S., Molina, D., Benjamins, R., Chatila, R., & Herrera, F. (2020). Explainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI): Concepts, Taxonomies, Opportunities and Challenges toward Responsible AI. Information Fusion, 58, 82–115. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.inffus.2019.101206

[9] Deloitte. (2025). Internal audit's role in strengthening AI governance. Deloitte.

[10] AI Now Institute. (2023). Algorithmic accountability: Moving beyond audits. AI Now Institute.

[11] Ernst & Young. (2025). How internal audit can adapt to AI. EY.