BUSINESS AND ECONOMICS RESEARCH JOURNAL

ISSN: 1309-2448
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.17047627

AUDITING AI IN FINANCE: A FRAMEWORK FOR INTERPRETABLE COMPLIANCE IN ALGORITHMIC DECISIONS

Dr. Sridhar Kodali,
HoD & Associate Professor, MBA Department,
Sir CRR College of Engineering, Eluru, Andhra Pradesh.

K. Aasha Sravanthi,
Assistant Professor, MBA Department,
Sir CRR College of Engineering, Eluru, Andhra Pradesh.

N Satheesh,
Assistant Professor, MBA Department,
Sir CRR College of Engineering, Eluru, Andhra Pradesh.

Dr Uttiya Basu,
Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce,
Adamas University.

Moupiya Bose,
Assistant Professor, Department of Management,
Brainware University.

Dr Anubha Srivastava,
Assistant Professor,
CHRIST University, Bangalore.

ABSTRACT

The adoption of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Machine Learning (ML) into financial services has transformed decision-making processes, providing increased efficiency, predictive accuracy, and scalable capabilities. Nevertheless the fact that many AI models are hard to understand makes it hard for companies to follow the rules, be open, and be responsible. Financial regulators are putting more and more stress on the need for systems that can be explained and audited to lower the risks of bias, unfair treatment, and unethical behavior in algorithmic decision-making. Even though there are tools that can help people understand how AI works, there are still no structured frameworks that connect AI auditing with financial rules. This research seeks to establish a thorough framework for auditing AI systems in finance, emphasizing interpretable compliance. The proposed framework incorporates three essential dimensions: (i) data audit, which tackles concerns of quality, bias, and privacy; (ii) model audit, which emphasizes interpretability, fairness, and explainability through advanced XAI techniques; and (iii) outcome audit, which guarantees decision transparency, accountability, and compliance with legal and ethical standards, including the GDPR, EU AI Act, Basel III, and national financial regulations. The study employs a hybrid methodology, integrating a conceptual framework with case-based validation, and deriving insights from applications in credit scoring, fraud detection, and risk assessment. The results are anticipated to make a theoretical contribution by connecting AI interpretability research with financial auditing, and a practical contribution by providing a structured guide for auditors, financial institutions, and regulators. The framework's main goal is to find a balance between the often conflicting goals of accuracy, fairness, and transparency. This will make sure that AI is used in finance in a way that is both new and responsible

Keywords:* *Artificial Intelligence (AI), Algorithmic Auditing, Explainable AI (XAI), Financial Compliance, Interpretability, Bias and Fairness

Introduction

The rapid adoption of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Machine Learning (ML) has transformed the financial services industry, reshaping decision-making and service delivery. More and more, banks and other financial institutions are using AI-powered tools for things like credit scoring, fraud detection, algorithmic trading, customer relationship management, investment forecasting, and risk assessment. Compared to traditional analytical methods, these technologies help businesses handle huge amounts of structured and unstructured data, find hidden patterns, and make decisions that are more accurate and timely. AI promises to make things more efficient, cut costs, improve customer experiences, and make businesses more competitive in the global financial landscape.

But there are also big problems that come with using AI. A lot of AI models, especially complex deep learning architectures, work like "black boxes," which means it's hard to understand how they come to their conclusions and make decisions. This lack of openness is dangerous when it comes to making financial decisions that directly affect people, businesses, and markets, like approving loans, finding fraud, or managing investments. When models unintentionally show biases that are already in their training data, it can lead to unfair or discriminatory results. For example, unfair credit scoring algorithms could turn down loans to people who are already at a disadvantage, making social inequalities worse.

Also, financial regulators all over the world are paying more attention to how AI is governed. The European Union's AI Act, the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), Basel III, and national regulatory guidelines all stress fairness, accountability, and explainability. Regulators want financial institutions to show that their AI systems are not only technically correct, but also morally responsible and in line with the law. Because financial markets are very sensitive and depend on trust, AI systems that are unclear, biased, or not compliant could hurt the credibility of institutions; put businesses at risk of legal penalties, and lower consumer confidence.

Review of Literature

AI and ML are now built into many core banking tasks, such as credit scoring, fraud detection, anti-money laundering (AML), risk modelling, and trading. These new methods are faster and more accurate than older ones. But their lack of transparency (also known as "black-box" behavior) makes it harder to hold people accountable for decisions that have a big impact on customers and markets. Recent sector analyses emphasize the potential benefits and systemic risks associated with the deployment of AI in the absence of sufficient governance, documentation, and validation (de Cos, 2024; Financial Stability Board, 2017). The Basel Committee and leaders of central banks say that gaps in explainability make model risk worse and could make future crises worse if there isn't good supervision and strong controls (de Cos, 2024).

Policy responses are increasingly aligning with risk-based governance. The EU Artificial Intelligence Act (which went into effect on August 1, 2024) sets standards for high-risk financial AI systems in terms of data quality, transparency, human oversight, and post-market monitoring. This creates a legal baseline for explainability and auditability (European Commission, 2024). The NIST AI Risk Management Framework (AI RMF 1.0) (2023) in the U.S. provides voluntary, lifecycle-oriented practices—GOVERN, MAP, MEASURE, MANAGE—that stress transparency, documentation, and continuous monitoring as necessary for trustworthiness (NIST, 2023). Banking supervisors still use model risk management rules like SR 11-7, but they apply them to ML situations by focusing on good governance, independent validation, conceptual soundness, and effective challenge (Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, 2011; BPI, 2024). Recent work by the BIS also says that governments should make their expectations about explainability methods and how well they work public (Crisanto, 2024).

Post-hoc and inherently interpretable techniques are progressing rapidly within technical literature. SHAP (Shapley Additive Explanations) offers theoretically sound local feature attributions and has emerged as the de facto standard for elucidating complex models employed in credit and fraud scenarios (Lundberg & Lee, 2017). Comparative evaluations and domain surveys indicate that SHAP/LIME and counterfactuals assist institutions in balancing accuracy with transparency, thereby facilitating internal validation, customer-facing explanations, and regulatory review (Černevičienė, 2024; Yıldız et al., 2025). Recent empirical research in credit scoring indicates that XAI can enhance stakeholder trust and regulatory defensibility with minimal performance compromises (e.g., integrating gradient-boosted trees with SHAP explanations) (JISEM, 2025). There are still tensions between local fidelity, stability of explanations, and usability for auditors. This shows that there is a need for standardized interpretability testing and documentation protocols.

Literature on AI fairness shows how historical data and other features, like digital traces, can hold structural biases. Algorithmic audits of credit scoring systems reveal that alternative data can create disparate effects, underscoring the necessity for regular fairness assessments, thorough documentation of data provenance, and established challenge procedures (McCanless, 2023). Benchmark studies assessing various mitigation strategies through fairness metrics demonstrate the intrinsic trade-offs between parity constraints and predictive performance. This indicates that fairness controls should be incorporated into model-risk and compliance programs, rather than regarded as mere afterthoughts (Zhang et al., 2022).

The literature is transitioning towards assurance and algorithmic auditing as formalized practices, beyond mere methodologies. Conceptual and design-science research suggests audit lifecycles that include documentation, data/process tracing, interpretability verification, performance/fairness testing, and outcome monitoring, all aligned with regulatory requirements and institutional controls (Lam et al., 2024; Goodman, 2020/2021). In finance, aligning these audit stages with model governance (inventorying, risk-tiering, change management, independent validation, and ongoing monitoring) makes "interpretable compliance" a reality. This lets auditors back up their decisions, repeat their explanations, and create evidence that is ready for regulators.

Statement of the Problem

Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Machine Learning (ML) have many benefits for the financial industry, but as they become more common, a big problem has come to light: AI models aren't easy to understand. Deep neural networks and ensemble learning methods are two of the most powerful algorithms, but they work like complicated "black boxes." They give outputs like credit approval, fraud alerts, or investment recommendations without giving clear reasons or explanations of how those results were reached. This lack of transparency makes it very hard for financial institutions to make sure they are following the rules and being held accountable.

It is possible to trace, document, and verify processes and outcomes against regulatory standards in traditional financial auditing. But with AI-driven decision-making, auditors often have trouble figuring out how models work or copying their internal logic. This makes it hard to find biases, check for fairness, or explain things to customers who are directly affected by decisions made by algorithms. If an AI system turns down a loan application, both regulators and consumers expect a clear reason why. If something can't be understood, there are often no reasons for it, which makes it less clear and accountable.

At the same time, governments all over the world are taking a stronger stand on responsible AI. The European Union's AI Act, the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), and Basel III's financial rules all stress the importance of algorithmic processes that can be explained, audited, and are fair. Not following the rules puts banks and other financial institutions at risk of legal trouble and bad publicity, and it also makes people less likely to trust AI-powered services.

So, the main problem is finding a way to connect the advanced technology of AI models with the need for compliance and openness in the law. To deal with these problems and make sure that AI is used responsibly in finance, it is important to create a structured framework that allows for systematic auditing of AI systems, with a focus on interpretability, fairness, and accountability.

Research Objectives

The primary aim of this study is to establish a systematic framework for auditing AI systems within financial services, emphasizing interpretability and compliance in algorithmic decision-making. The framework aims to connect advanced machine learning models with the financial sector's rules, ethics, and accountability needs.

Research Design

This study utilizes a qualitative-dominant mixed-methods design, integrating exploratory, descriptive, and applied research to formulate a framework for auditing AI in finance. Secondary data will be sourced from academic literature, regulatory frameworks (e.g., EU AI Act, GDPR, RBI circulars, Basel III), and industry reports. Primary data, when possible, will encompass expert interviews and validation workshops. We will use document and comparative analysis to figure out what the rules are and how well techniques like SHAP, LIME, and counterfactuals can be understood. A case study methodology will evaluate the framework on financial AI applications, including credit scoring and fraud detection, with expert assessment guaranteeing robustness and regulatory relevance. To check for transparency and accountability, analytical tools will include thematic coding, metrics for how easy it is to understand something, and fairness measures. The result will be a validated AI auditing framework that strikes a balance between accuracy, fairness, and following the rules. This framework will provide both academic contributions and practical advice for policymakers, auditors, and financial institutions.

Theoretical Framework

This study's theoretical foundation is based on three key perspectives: algorithmic accountability theory, stakeholder theory, and regulatory compliance frameworks. Together, they give you a clear way to audit AI in finance, focusing on fairness, compliance, and how easy it is to understand.

Algorithmic Accountability Theory stresses that organizations that use AI systems must make sure that the processes by which decisions are made are clear, traceable, and reasonable. In finance, where AI models are being used more and more for things like credit scoring, fraud detection, and investment management, accountability means that there need to be ways for auditors and regulators to understand how algorithmic outcomes are made. By using explainability methods like SHAP or LIME, this theory becomes real, allowing for interpretability audits that find biases, mistakes, and hidden decision paths. Stakeholder Theory adds to this by saying that AI-driven financial decisions affect many people, including customers, investors, regulators, and society as a whole. So, responsible auditing frameworks must protect the interests of all stakeholders by making sure that data is used fairly, equitably, and ethically. For instance, a biased algorithm for approving credit may hurt some demographic groups, which is against the law and damages people's trust in banks and other financial institutions. Integrating stakeholder concerns into the audit process guarantees that AI systems promote financial inclusion instead of perpetuating discrimination.

Integrating Artificial Intelligence (AI) into financial decision-making presents a dual challenge: ensuring efficiency and accuracy while maintaining compliance, fairness, and transparency. Conventional compliance frameworks are insufficient for AI-driven systems because of the opacity of machine learning models, commonly known as the "black-box problem." This requires a theoretical framework that connects the areas of AI interpretability, auditing, and following the rules.

The framework is based on three related theoretical pillars:

1. **Theory of Auditability** – Auditability is the ability to check, verify, and confirm the actions of an AI system on your own. In finance, this is similar to accountability mechanisms in regulatory theory, which say that decisions must leave a trail that can be checked. The theoretical foundation underscores the necessity for systematic audit protocols, encompassing data lineage tracking, model versioning, and reproducibility assessments, to guarantee compliance readiness.

2. **A model for Interpretability and Transparency** - Based on interpretability theory in machine learning, the framework assumes that both local and global explanations are necessary for compliance. Local interpretability (like case-specific explanations) helps make things fair for customers, while global interpretability (like feature importance and sensitivity analysis) helps keep an eye on the whole system. This theoretical integration makes sure that explanations are not only technically correct but also easy for regulators and other interested parties to understand.

3. **A framework for compliance mapping** - The last pillar brings together the theory of regulatory compliance, which says that the results of technical audits must be in line with legal standards like anti-discrimination, consumer protection, and prudential risk guidelines. The framework creates a compliance mapping matrix that turns audit results into legally useful evidence. This makes the idea of "explainable compliance" a reality.

These three pillars work together to create a theoretical model in which auditability allows for oversight, interpretability makes things clear, and compliance mapping makes sure that the law is followed. This framework is the basis for creating structured audit systems that not only build trust in institutions but also help meet regulatory goals in AI-driven financial systems.

Lastly, rules like the EU AI Act, GDPR, Basel III, and RBI/SEC guidelines set formal rules for being open, fair, and responsible. The proposed auditing stages—governance, data audits, interpretability checks, outcome testing, and continuous monitoring—are based on these frameworks. The framework makes sure that companies follow the law and are ready for changes in the regulatory landscape by making sure they follow the law. These theoretical perspectives provide a strong basis for creating an auditing framework that combines technical accuracy, ethical responsibility, and following the law. This will help AI be used more responsibly in finance.

Challenges and Limitations

There are many benefits to using a framework for interpretable compliance decisions to audit AI in finance, but there are also many important challenges and limitations that make it hard to do. These problems show how far apart financial institutions' goals are from what is actually possible.

1. Model Complexity - The models themselves are one of the biggest problems. Financial institutions frequently utilize sophisticated deep learning architectures for functions including fraud detection, anti-money laundering (AML), and credit risk forecasting. People like these models because they can find small patterns in huge datasets with great accuracy. But it's hard to understand how they work inside because there are thousands of parameters and non-linear interactions that can't be easily boiled down to simple explanations. When trying to make outputs that are easy to understand, there are often trade-offs. For example, overly simple explanations could misrepresent the decision logic, while very technical ones might be too hard for regulators and compliance officers to understand. This creates an ongoing conflict between how accurately something is interpreted and how useful it is for regulators.

2. Privacy Constraints – Another big problem is that financial data is very private. Audit processes usually need a lot of logging, tracking data lineage, and sharing evidence with auditors from inside or outside the company. But giving full transparency can accidentally reveal private customer information or business practices that are not public. Regulators often don't have the resources to safely handle a lot of sensitive data. Data anonymization, differential privacy, and secure multiparty computation are examples of privacy-preserving technologies that offer partial solutions. However, they also make evidence less detailed and may weaken the audit's strength. So, there is a natural conflict between protecting data and making audits clear.

3. Operational Burden - To set up a complete audit framework, you need a lot of resources, like infrastructure, skilled workers, and ongoing monitoring. Big international banks may be able to use compliance dashboards, automated audit scripts, and governance committees, but smaller banks and other financial institutions often don't have the money or technical know-how to do the same. This could lead to a compliance gap, where smaller companies either don't meet regulatory standards or have to rely on outside auditing services, which could make them more dependent and less independent.

4. Risk of "Checklist Compliance" - Finally, there is a risk that audits will turn into a way to check off boxes. Institutions may only make documents and interpretability reports to meet regulatory requirements, and they may not make transparency a part of their everyday operations. These kinds of shallow practices may show technical compliance, but they don't fix the deeper problems of fairness, accountability, and customer trust. This makes AI governance less effective and the audit process less trustworthy over time.

In conclusion, the framework provides a structured approach for responsible AI governance; however, it is essential to recognize and systematically tackle challenges pertaining to model interpretability, data privacy, resource inequities, and superficial compliance practices.

Policy Implications

Banks and other financial institutions' internal governance functions cannot be the only way to approach AI auditing in the financial industry. Because AI-driven decisions can be opaque and possibly biased, regulators and policymakers need to play an active role in setting standards, overseeing them, and creating ways for people to work together. The subsequent policy implications are derived from the challenges and recommendations highlighted in the case study, providing a framework for regulatory intervention.

1. Establish Minimum Interpretability Standards

Policymakers should require that all important AI systems in finance meet minimum standards for how easy they are to understand. This means that each model must give both global explanations (like overall feature importance and sensitivity to key variables) and local explanations (like why a certain loan was turned down). Regulators can make sure that compliance officers, auditors, and even customers get useful information about AI-driven decisions by making interpretability requirements into law. These kinds of standards would make people less likely to rely too much on black-box models and encourage the use of explainable AI methods.

2. Develop Privacy-Preserving Audit Protocols

There needs to be a balance between being open about audits and keeping financial data private. Regulators should push for or make the use of privacy-preserving audit tools like federated learning, differential privacy, and secure multiparty computation required. These technologies let auditors and other supervisory bodies check that models are following the rules without having to see private or financial information directly. Policymakers can also make tiered evidence-sharing rules official. This way, only the most important audit evidence is shared outside the institution, and sensitive information stays safe inside.

3. Scale Compliance Requirements Proportionately

The gap in compliance between big multinational banks and smaller financial institutions is a big policy issue. Larger organizations have the money to set up full audit systems, but smaller ones may have trouble doing so. Regulators need to create compliance frameworks that are fair. For instance, they should require more audits from high-risk institutions and make it easier for smaller businesses to comply by giving them simpler audit templates, shared compliance platforms, or free tools. This proportionality makes sure that everyone has the same chance to succeed without stifling new ideas or putting too much pressure on smaller businesses.

4. Shift to Outcome-Based Supervision

Regulatory oversight needs to stop using "checklist compliance" or other purely procedural models. Instead, supervisory frameworks should use an outcome-based approach, which means that institutions must show that their AI systems are fair, strong, and accountable in a way that can be measured. Regulators should set clear performance standards, like acceptable levels of demographic parity, differences in error rates, or resistance to changes in distribution, and require regular reporting on these standards. This change would make people less likely to comply with tokens and encourage a culture of constant monitoring and improvement.

5. Institutionalize Independent AI Auditing

Policymakers should encourage independent third-party AI audits to protect against conflicts of interest and regulatory capture. These auditors should be certified by the authorities that oversee them and changed out often to make sure they are unbiased. Independent audits would give regulators proof of compliance that is objective and can be verified. They would also help institutions find hidden risks. Making a list of certified AI auditors would make this new field more professional and make people more confident in AI systems that handle money.

6. Foster Multi-Stakeholder Collaboration

Finally, regulators need to realize that they can't do AI auditing well on their own. Policymakers can lead multi-stakeholder platforms that bring together groups like consumer advocacy groups, researchers, technology providers, and financial institutions. These platforms could help people work together to create audit standards, share best practices, and help people learn from each other. Regulatory sandboxes are a great way to test new AI audit methods in a safe setting before they are made into formal rules.

Conclusion

Auditing AI in finance is both very important and very hard. As banks and other financial institutions use more and more advanced machine learning models to score credit, find fraud, and manage risk, the fact that these models are hard to understand makes it harder to be open, responsible, and trust consumers. This case study has shown that AI can make things more efficient and accurate, but it needs to be used in a way that is controlled by strong audit frameworks that take into account technical performance, compliance with rules, and moral responsibility.

The analysis showed that there are a lot of problems, such as how hard it is to understand complex models, how audit transparency can put privacy at risk, how hard it is for smaller institutions to run, and how dangerous it is to only follow a "checklist." To get rid of these barriers, we need more than just new technologies like explainable AI and privacy-preserving audits.

The recommendations and policy implications stress that regulators, financial institutions, and researchers need to work together to make AI auditing a long-term success. Policymakers can make sure that AI-driven decisions are both clear and reliable by adding interpretability requirements, making compliance proportional to the size of the organization, and moving toward outcome-based oversight. Also, making independent audits a regular part of the process and encouraging collaboration between different groups will be important for making the financial sector more accountable.

Finally, the path forward requires acknowledging that responsible AI is as much a governance imperative as it is a technological one. If regulators and institutions can make AI audits more understandable, fair, and accountable, they can not only lower systemic risks but also boost public trust in new financial technologies. This makes auditing AI more than just a compliance exercise; it is a fundamental component of creating a financial ecosystem that is more inclusive, moral, and resilient.

Reference

1. Desai, H. (2025). Reimagining Compliance: Explainable AI Models for Financial Regulatory Audits. In *Insights in Banking Analytics and Regulatory Compliance Using AI* (pp. 259-284). IGI Global Scientific Publishing.
2. OLAWORE, S. O., OKOLI, C., ABIMBOLA, O., SERIFAT, B. U. U. U. D., OFURUM, A., & LEO, O. (2025). AI-Driven Cybersecurity Governance in Financial Services: Enhancing Ethical Auditing, Automated Compliance Monitoring and Explainable AI for Stakeholder Trust.
3. Chinnaraju, A. (2025). Explainable AI (XAI) for trustworthy and transparent decision-making: A theoretical framework for AI interpretability. *World Journal of Advanced Engineering Technology and Sciences*, *14*(3), 170-207.
4. Akula, R., & Garibay, I. (2021). Audit and assurance of AI algorithms: a framework to ensure ethical algorithmic practices in artificial intelligence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.14046*.
5. Chakrabarti, M., Fabozzi, F. J., Narain, A., & Sood, A. (2025). Ethical AI in Asset Management: Frameworks for Transparency, Compliance, and Trust. *Journal of Financial Data Science*, *7*(1).
6. Rane, N., Choudhary, S., & Rane, J. (2023). Explainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI) approaches for transparency and accountability in financial decision-making. *Available at SSRN 4640316*.
7. Anang, A. N., Ajewumi, O. E., Sonubi, T., Nwafor, K. C., Arogundade, J. B., & Akinbi, I. J. (2024). Explainable AI in financial technologies: Balancing innovation with regulatory compliance. *International Journal of Science and Research Archive*, *13*(1), 1793-1806.
8. Chitnis, A. S. H. I. T. O. S. H. (2023). Enhancing SOX Compliance: Leveraging Explainable AI for Automated Financial Audits. *IRE Journals*, *7*(4), 607-616.
9. Mohanarajesh, K. (2024). Investigate Methods for Visualizing the Decision-Making Processes of a Complex AI System, Making Them More Understandable and Trustworthy in financial data analysis.
10. Riana, N., Mulyani, S. R., & Aripin, Z. (2024). ASSESSING THE IMPACT OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE ON FINANCIAL AUDITING AND RISK ASSESSMENT. *KRIEZ ACADEMY: Journal of development and community service*, *1*(10), 38-56.

11. Desai, A. (2025). Ethical AI Governance in Automated Financial Decision Systems: Balancing Predictive Accuracy with Regulatory Compliance. *Available at SSRN 5283407*.
12. BPI (Bank Policy Institute). (2024). *Navigating artificial intelligence in banking*. https://bpi.com/wp-content/uploads/2024/04/Navigating-Artificial-Intelligence-in-Banking.pdf Bank Policy Institute
13. Černevičienė, J. (2024). Explainable artificial intelligence (XAI) in finance. *Artificial Intelligence Review*. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10462-024-10854-8 SpringerLink
14. Crisanto, J. C. (2024). *Regulating AI in the financial sector: Recent developments and future regulatory challenges* (FSI Insights No. 63). BIS. https://www.bis.org/fsi/publ/insights63.pdf Bank for International Settlements
15. Financial Stability Board. (2017). *Artificial intelligence and machine learning in financial services*. https://www.fsb.org/uploads/P011117.pdf Financial Stability Board
16. Goodman, E. P. (2021). Algorithmic auditing: Chasing AI accountability. *Santa Clara High Technology Law Journal,37*(3), 431–489. https://digitalcommons.law.scu.edu/context/chtlj/article/1689/viewcontent/11_Goodman___Algorithmic_Auditing_Chasing_AI_Accountability_PUBLISHED.pdf Santa Clara Law Digital Commons
17. JISEM. (2025). Explainable AI in credit scoring: Improving transparency and compliance. *Journal of Information Systems Engineering & Management*. https://jisem-journal.com/index.php/journal/article/download/4437/2059/7352 JISEM
18. Lam, K., et al. (2024). A framework for assurance audits of algorithmic systems. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*. https://dl.acm.org/doi/abs/10.1145/3630106.3658957 ACM Digital Library
19. Lundberg, S. M., & Lee, S.-I. (2017). A unified approach to interpreting model predictions. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 30*. https://arxiv.org/abs/1705.07874;https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.5555/3295222.3295230 arXivACM Digital Library
20. McCanless, M. (2023). Banking on alternative credit scores: Auditing the algorithm. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space, 55*(6), 1502–1521. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0308518X231174026 SAGE Journals
21. NIST. (2023). *Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework (AI RMF 1.0)*. https://nvlpubs.nist.gov/nistpubs/ai/nist.ai.100-1.pdf NIST Publications

22. Zhang, X., et al. (2022). Algorithmic decision-making methods for fair credit scoring. *arXiv preprint*. https://arxiv.org/html/2209.07912
23. Reuters. (2024, March 1). Legal transparency in AI finance: Facing the accountability dilemma. https://www.reuters.com/legal/transactional/legal-transparency-ai-finance-facing-accountability-dilemma-digital-decision-2024-03-01/ Reuters
24. de Cos, P. H. (2024, April 17). *Managing AI in banking: Are we ready to cooperate?* BIS speech. https://www.bis.org/speeches/sp240417.pdf Bank for International Settlements
25. European Commission. (2024, August 1). *AI Act enters into force*. https://commission.europa.eu/news-and-media/news/ai-act-enters-force-2024-08-01_en European Commission
26. Malali, N., & Madugula, S. R. P. (2025, May). Implementing Explainable AI for Proactive Regulatory Compliance and Auditing in Financial Markets. In *2025 International Conference on Networks and Cryptology (NETCRYPT)* (pp. 529-534). IEEE.
27. Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. (2011). *SR 11-7: Guidance on model risk management*. https://www.federalreserve.gov/supervisionreg/srletters/sr1107.htm Federal Reserve.