INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LEGAL SCIENCE AND INNOVATION

[ISSN 2581-9453]

Volume 7 | Issue 3

2025

© 2025 International Journal of Legal Science and Innovation

Follow this and additional works at: https://www.ijlsi.com/

Under the aegis of VidhiAagaz – Inking Your Brain (https://www.vidhiaagaz.com)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the International Journal of Legal Science and Innovation at VidhiAagaz. It has been accepted for inclusion in International Journal of Legal Science and Innovation after due review.

In case of **any suggestion or complaint**, please contact **support@vidhiaagaz.com.**

To submit your Manuscript for Publication at **International Journal of Legal Science and Innovation**, kindly email your Manuscript at **editor.ijlsi@gmail.com.**

The Paradox of Codification in the Age of Adaptive Governance: A Comparative Study

VU MINH CHAU[1]

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the fundamental tension between administrative law codification and adaptive governance imperatives, challenging the assumption that these approaches are inherently incompatible. Through a comparative study of Germany, France, and the United Kingdom, this research reveals how different legal systems navigate the competing demands for legal certainty and regulatory flexibility in response to complex contemporary challenges such as climate change, public health emergencies, and technological disruption. Analyzing legislative frameworks, administrative practices, and judicial decisions from 2000-2022, the study demonstrates how procedural codes are evolving beyond their traditional stabilizing function to incorporate adaptive mechanisms that enable responsive governance while maintaining rule of law safeguards. The findings suggest the emergence of "adaptive codification"—a hybrid approach that embeds flexibility tools within procedural frameworks—with significant implications for administrative law theory and reform. This study contributes to both codification and adaptive governance scholarship by identifying pathways for reconciling seemingly contradictory administrative law traditions in an era of accelerating complexity.

Keywords: *Administrative law codification, Adaptive governance, Comparative administrative law, Procedural flexibility, Emergency powers*

I. INTRODUCTION

The Tension Between Codification and Adaptation

Administrative law stands at a crossroads. Traditional codification—the systematic organization of procedural rules into comprehensive legal instruments—has long promised predictability, transparency, and accountability in bureaucratic governance (Weber, 1978). Yet contemporary regulatory challenges increasingly demand what scholars term "adaptive governance"—flexible, experimental, and responsive administrative approaches capable of addressing complex, dynamic problems under conditions of uncertainty (Folke et al., 2005). This fundamental tension manifests across jurisdictions as governments confront climate change, global pandemics, and rapid technological transformation while maintaining rule of

[1] Author is a Phd Candidate at University of Law, Vietnam National University, Vietnam.

© 2025. International Journal of Legal Science and Innovation [ISSN 2581-9453]

law commitments (Auby, 2019). Germany's Administrative Procedure Act (*Verwaltungsverfahrensgesetz*), France's Code des relations entre le public et l'administration (CRPA), and the United Kingdom's uncodified administrative law tradition offer compelling cases for examining how different legal systems navigate this paradox.

Defining the Scope

For this study, "codification" refers to the systematic organization of administrative procedures into a comprehensive legal framework that governs agency decision-making, public participation, and judicial review. This definition frames the analysis of how codified procedures interact with adaptive demands. "Adaptive governance" denotes administrative approaches characterized by flexibility, learning, experimentation, and responsiveness to changing conditions under uncertainty (Folke et al., 2005). The paper focuses on three domains where this tension is particularly acute: environmental regulation addressing climate change, public health emergency responses (especially COVID-19), and regulation of emerging technologies.

The Research Problem

Despite growing recognition of both procedural certainty and regulatory adaptability as essential governance values, research has inadequately examined how different legal systems reconcile these competing imperatives in practice. Existing scholarship treats codification and adaptation as opposing forces, failing to identify how administrative systems actually integrate these approaches (Cosens & Craig, 2018). While some studies document innovative regulatory techniques, they rarely connect these to broader administrative law frameworks or compare approaches across jurisdictions (Auby, 2019). This gap limits our understanding of how administrative law can simultaneously provide stability and enable flexibility.

Thesis Statement

This paper contends that the apparent paradox between codification and adaptive governance is being resolved through the emergence of "adaptive codification"—a hybrid approach that embeds flexibility mechanisms within procedural frameworks rather than treating stability and adaptability as mutually exclusive values.

II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Codification Theory and Legal Certainty

Administrative codification emerged from the legal-rational tradition, emphasizing what Weber termed "formal rationality" in bureaucratic governance (Weber, 1978). Its theoretical

justifications include legal certainty (predictable application of rules), democratic legitimacy (legislative control over administration), and judicial reviewability (clear standards for evaluating administrative action) (Schmidt-Aßmann, 2008). Codification scholarship has traditionally emphasized what Scheuerman calls "the temporal dimension of the rule of law"—establishing stable, enduring procedures that constrain administrative discretion and protect citizen expectations (Scheuerman, 2006). In continental European traditions, particularly Germany's *Rechtsstaat*, comprehensive procedural codes represent the culmination of administrative law development, embodying what Schmidt-Aßmann terms "the systematization of administrative rationality" (Schmidt-Aßmann, 2008).

Adaptive Governance Theory

Emerging from environmental management and regulatory theory, adaptive governance challenges traditional administrative law assumptions. As articulated by Folke and colleagues, adaptive governance emphasizes learning, experimentation, and responsiveness to changing conditions under uncertainty (Folke et al., 2005). Building on this foundation, legal scholars including Cosens and Craig have identified how administrative law can either facilitate or hinder adaptive approaches (Cosens & Craig, 2018). Adaptive governance values what Sabel and Zeitlin term "experimentalist governance"—iterative processes that set framework goals, grant implementation discretion to local units, and require regular reporting and peer review (Sabel & Zeitlin, 2012). This approach contrasts with codification's emphasis on ex ante procedural specification.

New Governance and Experimentalism

The tension between codification and adaptation connects to broader debates about "new governance" approaches that depart from command-and-control regulation. As de Búrca and Scott argue, new governance emphasizes participatory deliberation, flexibility, revisability, and diversity rather than uniform procedural rules (de Búrca & Scott, 2006). Experimentalist governance similarly values provisional rule-making with built-in feedback mechanisms rather than permanent procedural dictates (Sabel & Zeitlin, 2012). These perspectives challenge administrative law's traditional emphasis on procedural stability, suggesting that effective governance requires what Dorf and Sabel call "learning by monitoring" rather than rigid adherence to predetermined processes (Dorf & Sabel, 1998).

Critical Review of Existing Literature

Current scholarship exhibits three significant limitations this study addresses. First, administrative law literature often treats codification and adaptation as mutually exclusive

rather than potentially complementary approaches (Cosens & Craig, 2018). Second, adaptive governance scholarship frequently overlooks how procedural certainty can actually facilitate rather than impede regulatory flexibility (Fisher, 2007). As Fisher argues, well-designed procedures can create "deliberative spaces" that enable rather than constrain administrative adaptation (Fisher, 2006). Third, comparative analyses rarely examine how different legal systems reconcile these competing values across multiple regulatory domains (Auby, 2019).

This paper contributes by examining how administrative law systems with varying codification levels actually integrate adaptive elements while maintaining rule of law values, bridging theoretical divides between administrative law and adaptive governance scholarship.

III. METHODOLOGY

Research Design and Case Selection

This study employs structured, focused comparison of administrative law systems selected to maximize variation in codification approaches while maintaining comparability in adaptive governance challenges. Germany represents a mature, highly codified system with its Administrative Procedure Act (VwVfG) establishing comprehensive procedural requirements (Ruffert, 2021). France provides a compelling intermediate case with its recently adopted Code des relations entre le public et l'administration (CRPA), representing what Conseil d'État President Bruno Lasserre calls "modernized codification" (Sauvé, 2016). The United Kingdom exemplifies a largely uncodified system relying on common law principles, specific statutes, and judicial review to structure administrative process (Harlow & Rawlings, 2021). These cases span the codification spectrum while facing similar adaptive governance challenges in environmental regulation, public health, and technological governance.

Data Collection and Sources

The analysis draws on four primary data sources: (1) Legal frameworks including Germany's VwVfG, France's CRPA, and the UK's sector-specific administrative legislation; (2) Judicial decisions addressing administrative flexibility and procedural requirements from each jurisdiction's highest administrative courts (2000-2022); (3) Administrative guidance documents, particularly those addressing adaptive approaches in the three focal domains; and (4) Secondary literature analyzing administrative law developments in each jurisdiction. This combination enables triangulation across legal, judicial, administrative, and scholarly sources to enhance validity.

Analytical Framework

The study analyzes administrative law systems along three dimensions: (1) Procedural architecture—how systems structure administrative procedures and the degree of codification; (2) Flexibility mechanisms—specific legal tools that enable adaptation within procedural frameworks; and (3) Domain variation—how approaches differ across environmental, public health, and technological governance. Following Abbott and Snidal's approach to regulatory analysis, the research identifies patterns across systems through systematic comparison of how each jurisdiction manages similar adaptive governance challenges (Abbott & Snidal, 2009).

Limitations and Mitigation Strategies

The study's limitations include challenges comparing different legal traditions, potential language barriers in accessing sources, and the difficulty of establishing causal relationships between legal frameworks and adaptive outcomes. These limitations were addressed through consultation with country specialists, using official translations where available, and focusing on concrete legal mechanisms rather than attempting to measure effectiveness directly. The comparative design strengthens validity by identifying cross-jurisdictional patterns that transcend individual case idiosyncrasies.

IV. GERMANY: STRUCTURED FLEXIBILITY WITHIN CODIFICATION

The German Administrative Procedure Architecture

Germany's highly codified administrative system demonstrates how procedural certainty and adaptive capacity can coexist through deliberate legal design. The Administrative Procedure Act (VwVfG) establishes comprehensive procedural requirements that apply across regulatory domains, creating what Schmidt-Aßmann terms a "stabilizing procedural infrastructure" (Schmidt-Aßmann, 2008). However, German administrative law has developed what Voßkuhle calls "structured flexibility techniques" that enable adaptation while maintaining procedural integrity (Voßkuhle, 2012).

Three features characterize Germany's approach to reconciling codification with adaptation. First, the VwVfG establishes general procedural principles while leaving significant implementation discretion to authorities. Section 10, for example, requires that administrative procedures be "simple, expedient and timely" without dictating specific methodologies, creating what Ruffert describes as "principled flexibility" (Ruffert, 2021). Second, the system employs framework legislation (*Rahmengesetzgebung*) that establishes procedural parameters while delegating adaptive implementation to specialized agencies (Franzius, 2012). Third,

German administrative law has developed formalized procedures for norm-specification (*Normkonkretisierung*) that allow technical standards to evolve without requiring legislative amendment (Stelkens, 2018).

Climate Change Adaptation: Framework Legislation with Procedural Safeguards

Germany's approach to climate governance illustrates how codified procedures can accommodate adaptive needs. The Federal Climate Change Act (*Bundes-Klimaschutzgesetz*) of 2019 and its 2021 amendments demonstrate what Franzius terms "adaptable framework regulation" (Franzius, 2012). The Act establishes binding emission reduction targets and sectoral carbon budgets while creating formalized adaptation procedures—including mandatory review cycles, expert council evaluations, and procedural mechanisms for adjusting implementation measures without amending the underlying legislation (Franzius, 2012).

The Federal Constitutional Court's landmark climate decision of March 24, 2021 (*1 BvR 2656/18*) reinforced this approach by requiring "proceduralized adaptation" rather than fixed regulatory solutions. The Court held that climate regulation must include "structured updating procedures" that enable responsive governance while maintaining democratic accountability—essentially mandating adaptive mechanisms within the procedural framework. This approach has been implemented through what Gärditz calls "staged proceduralization," where adaptation occurs through predetermined procedural channels rather than ad hoc adjustments (Gärditz, 2021).

Pandemic Response: General Clauses and Specific Procedures

Germany's response to COVID-19 reveals how codified systems manage emergency adaptation. The Infection Protection Act (*Infektionsschutzgesetz*) employed what Klafki terms "proceduralized emergency powers"—general authorization clauses paired with specific procedural requirements including time limitations, parliamentary oversight procedures, and mandatory scientific justification (Klafki, 2017). When the Federal Administrative Court reviewed emergency measures in *BVerwG 3 CN 2.21* (November 22, 2021), it endorsed this approach, holding that "procedural safeguards enable necessary flexibility while constraining arbitrary action."

These procedures included mandatory scientific consultation, iterative assessment requirements, and sunset provisions that required regular legislative renewal. As Rixen notes, this approach "channeled adaptation through procedural pathways" rather than suspending procedural requirements entirely (Rixen, 2021). The system thus maintained legal certainty not by fixing substantive outcomes but by establishing clear procedures for adaptation itself.

Digital Economy Regulation: Norm-Specification Procedures

Germany's approach to regulating digital technologies demonstrates a third adaptive mechanism within codification: formalized procedures for technical norm-specification. The Network Enforcement Act (*Netzwerkdurchsetzungsgesetz*) established what Eifert calls "proceduralized co-regulation"—binding procedural requirements for content removal while allowing technical implementation standards to evolve through structured consultation procedures with experts, stakeholders, and regulators (Eifert, 2017).

This approach relies on Section 35 VwVfG's provisions for administrative guidance (*Verwaltungsvorschriften*), which the Federal Administrative Court has recognized as a legitimate tool for "dynamic norm concretization" in technical domains (*BVerwG 7 C 26.16*, January 25, 2018). As Stelkens notes, these procedures create a "managed adaptive space within codified boundaries," allowing technical standards to evolve while maintaining procedural legitimacy (Stelkens, 2018).

Germany thus demonstrates that highly codified systems can incorporate adaptive capacity through deliberate legal mechanisms that channel flexibility through procedural pathways rather than treating adaptation as procedural exception.

V. FRANCE: MODERNIZED CODIFICATION WITH ADAPTIVE TOOLS

France's New Administrative Code: The CRPA

France's adoption of the Code des relations entre le public et l'administration (CRPA) in 2015 represents what Conseil d'État Vice President Jean-Marc Sauvé termed "codification for the 21st century" (Sauvé, 2016). This recent codification effort explicitly sought to reconcile traditional procedural certainty with contemporary demands for administrative responsiveness. The CRPA's approach to this tension reveals three distinctive features of modern codification.

First, the CRPA incorporates what Pontier calls "graduated proceduralization"—varying procedural requirements based on the nature and context of administrative action rather than imposing uniform procedures (Pontier, 2019). Article L131-1, for example, establishes different procedural tracks for conventional rulemaking versus experimental or emergency measures. Second, the Code explicitly recognizes experimentation as a legitimate administrative technique, with Articles L221-1 to L221-2 establishing procedural frameworks for administrative experiments including evaluation requirements and scaling procedures. Third, the CRPA formalizes soft law instruments (*actes de droit souple*) as recognized administrative tools while subjecting them to proportional procedural controls (Chevallier,

2021).

These features reflect what Caillosse calls a "procedural rather than substantive" approach to codification—establishing decision-making processes and accountability mechanisms without rigidly predetermining administrative methods (Caillosse, 2014).

Climate Adaptation: Experimental Procedures and Scaling Mechanisms

France's climate regulation demonstrates how modern codification incorporates experimental governance. The 2019 Energy and Climate Law (*Loi énergie-climat*) establishes what Marzal terms "nested experimentation procedures"—formalized multi-level processes for developing, testing, evaluating, and scaling climate adaptation measures (Marzal, 2021). These procedures operate through the CRPA's experimentation framework, which requires initial authorization, specified evaluation criteria, and explicit procedures for either terminating experiments or incorporating successful approaches into regular governance.

The Conseil d'État's decision in *Association Les Amis de la Terre* (July 19, 2021) reinforced this approach, holding that climate adaptation requires both "procedural rigor and substantive flexibility." The court endorsed experimental governance while requiring adherence to CRPA's procedural framework for monitoring and evaluation. This approach embodies what Jégouzo calls "proceduralized learning"—using administrative procedures to structure rather than prevent adaptation (Jégouzo, 2017).

Pandemic Response: Proportional Proceduralization

France's COVID-19 response illustrates how modern codification provides differentiated procedures for emergency contexts. The CRPA's provisions for *urgence sanitaire* established what Béchillon describes as "proportional proceduralization"—streamlined but not eliminated procedures for emergency measures, including accelerated consultation requirements, simplified impact assessment, and enhanced ex post review (Béchillon, 2020). These procedures enabled rapid response while maintaining what the Conseil d'État termed "procedural discipline" in its May 13, 2020 decision reviewing emergency restrictions.

Notably, the CRPA's Article L243-2 creates a specific procedural track for emergency measures that preserves core due process values while acknowledging temporal constraints. This approach reflects what Noguellou calls "differentiated formalism"—adapting procedural requirements to context rather than suspending procedural protections entirely (Noguellou, 2020). The French approach thus demonstrates how codification can incorporate emergency response capabilities through context-sensitive procedural design.

Digital Regulation: Soft Law Recognition

France's approach to digital economy regulation demonstrates a third adaptive mechanism: the formalization of soft law within codified administrative procedure. The CRPA's explicit recognition of *actes de droit souple* (soft law instruments) in Articles L312-2 and L312-3 legitimizes what Chevallier calls "graduated normativity"—administrative guidance that enables adaptation without requiring formal rulemaking (Chevallier, 2021). The Conseil d'État's expansion of judicial review to cover certain soft law instruments in *Société Fairvesta International* (2016) further institutionalized this approach, creating what Melleray terms "procedural discipline for flexible instruments" (Melleray, 2016).

The French regulatory authority ARCEP has employed this approach extensively in digital regulation, using "adaptive guidance documents" (*documents d'orientation évolutifs*) that establish technical standards through collaborative processes while maintaining procedural transparency. As Frison-Roche notes, this approach enables "responsive expertise while preserving procedural values" by subjecting adaptive instruments to proportionate procedural requirements (Frison-Roche, 2021).

France's experience demonstrates how recent codification efforts explicitly incorporate adaptive governance mechanisms, suggesting an evolution in codification's purpose from purely stabilizing administrative procedure to structuring adaptability itself.

VI. UNITED KINGDOM: PROCEDURAL CERTAINTY IN AN UNCODIFIED SYSTEM

The UK's Uncodified Administrative Architecture

The United Kingdom's largely uncodified administrative law system provides a contrasting approach to managing the tension between procedural certainty and adaptive governance. Without a comprehensive administrative procedure act, the UK relies on what Harlow and Rawlings term a "composite administrative law" comprising common law principles, sector-specific statutes, administrative tribunals, and judicial review (Harlow & Rawlings, 2021). This approach offers inherent flexibility but creates challenges for procedural certainty and cross-sectoral consistency.

Three features characterize the UK's approach to balancing certainty and adaptation. First, the system employs what Craig calls "common law constitutionalism"—judicial development of procedural principles that apply across administrative contexts without rigid codification (Craig, 2004). Second, the UK extensively uses framework legislation that establishes general procedural expectations while delegating implementation details to administrative bodies

(Harlow & Rawlings, 2021). Third, the system has developed specialized oversight mechanisms, particularly regulatory impact assessment and post-implementation review, that provide procedural structure without dictating specific regulatory approaches.

Climate Regulation: Framework Acts with Structured Discretion

The UK's approach to climate governance illustrates how uncodified systems can provide procedural structure for adaptive challenges. The Climate Change Act 2008 established what Fisher terms a "procedural infrastructure for adaptive policy-making"—mandatory carbon budgets, independent expert committee review, and formalized adaptation planning processes without dictating specific regulatory measures (Fisher, 2007). This legislation creates what Scotford and Minas call "proceduralized goal-setting" that enables flexibility in implementation while maintaining accountability through structured reporting and review requirements (Scotford & Minas, 2019).

The High Court's decision in *Plan B Earth v. Secretary of State for Transport* [2020] EWCA Civ 214 reinforced this approach, holding that climate adaptation requires "structured discretion rather than unfettered flexibility." The court emphasized that administrative adaptation must occur within procedural frameworks that ensure accountability, even in uncodified systems. This approach demonstrates how common law systems can develop procedural certainty for adaptive governance without comprehensive codification.

Pandemic Response: Delegated Powers with Procedural Safeguards

The UK's COVID-19 response reveals how uncodified systems address emergency adaptation. The Coronavirus Act 2020 employed what Gordon and Sandhurst call "proceduralized emergency powers"—broad delegations paired with sunset provisions, parliamentary review requirements, and proportionality constraints (Gordon & Sandhurst, 2020). Rather than codifying detailed procedures, the legislation established structured oversight mechanisms including regular review cycles and ministerial reporting requirements.

The Administrative Court's decision in *R (Dolan) v. Secretary of State for Health* [2020] EWCA Civ 1605 acknowledged this approach, with the court finding that emergency powers required "enhanced procedural scrutiny" to compensate for substantive flexibility. As King notes, this approach relied on "process values rather than rigid procedural rules" to constrain emergency discretion (King, 2020). The UK thus demonstrates how uncodified systems can develop procedural safeguards for exceptional circumstances without comprehensive procedural codes.

© 2025. International Journal of Legal Science and Innovation [ISSN 2581-9453]

Digital Economy: Experimental Regulation with Procedural Boundaries

The UK's approach to regulating digital technologies demonstrates a third approach to procedural certainty in uncodified systems: experimental regulation within procedural boundaries. The Digital Economy Act 2017 established what Yeung calls "structured regulatory experimentation"—explicitly authorizing regulatory sandboxes, innovation waivers, and iterative rule development while establishing procedural safeguards including transparency requirements, time limitations, and evaluation criteria (Yeung, 2013).

These experimental approaches operate within what the Competition and Markets Authority terms "procedural frameworks for innovation"—structured processes for developing, testing, and evaluating novel regulatory approaches. The UK Court of Appeal in *R (Bridges) v. Chief Constable of South Wales Police* [2020] EWCA Civ 1058 endorsed this approach while emphasizing that experimental regulation requires "enhanced procedural protections" to compensate for substantive uncertainty.

The UK's experience demonstrates that uncodified systems can develop procedural certainty through a combination of common law principles, framework legislation, and specialized oversight mechanisms that structure rather than prevent administrative adaptation.

VII. DISCUSSION: RECONCILING CODIFICATION AND ADAPTIVE GOVERNANCE

The analysis reveals four cross-cutting patterns that deepen our understanding of the relationship between administrative law codification and adaptive governance.

First, the findings challenge the assumed dichotomy between procedural certainty and administrative flexibility. All three systems demonstrate what can be termed "proceduralization of adaptation"—embedding flexibility mechanisms within procedural frameworks rather than treating adaptation as procedural exception (Fisher, 2007). Germany's framework legislation with formalized updating procedures, France's explicit experimentation provisions, and the UK's structured discretion within impact assessment frameworks all illustrate how procedural certainty can enable rather than constrain adaptation when deliberately designed for this purpose.

Second, the comparative analysis reveals an evolution in codification's function from static procedural specification to dynamic process management. Modern codification efforts like France's CRPA explicitly incorporate what Auby calls "procedural architectures for uncertainty"—frameworks that structure how adaptation occurs rather than preventing adaptation itself (Auby, 2019). This represents a significant theoretical shift from Weber's

conception of codification as bureaucratic rationalization toward what might be termed "procedural enablement" (Weber, 1978).

Third, the findings demonstrate the emergence of "graduated proceduralization" across systems with different codification levels. All three jurisdictions have developed varied procedural tracks for different administrative contexts—more structured procedures for routine administration and streamlined but not eliminated procedures for adaptive challenges. This approach preserves procedural values while acknowledging diverse administrative needs, suggesting convergence around what Fisher terms "contextual proceduralism" rather than uniform procedural requirements (Fisher, 2006).

Fourth, the relationship between codification and judicial review reveals an important institutional dimension. In all three systems, courts have played a crucial role in legitimizing adaptive governance while enforcing procedural discipline. The German Federal Constitutional Court's climate decision mandating structured updating procedures, the Conseil d'État's recognition of experimental governance within procedural boundaries, and the UK courts' emphasis on enhanced procedural scrutiny for discretionary powers all demonstrate what Harlow terms "judicial proceduralization of administrative flexibility" (Harlow, 2006).

These patterns suggest a refined theoretical understanding of administrative law that moves beyond the false choice between rigid codification and unstructured flexibility. The emerging model of "adaptive codification" emphasizes what Sabel and Zeitlin call "dynamic accountability"—using procedural frameworks to structure adaptation rather than prevent it (Sabel & Zeitlin, 2012). This approach maintains administrative law's commitment to legal certainty and accountability while enabling responsive governance in complex, uncertain regulatory domains.

VIII. CONCLUSION

Key Findings and Contribution

This study demonstrates that administrative law systems across the codification spectrum are developing similar approaches to reconciling procedural certainty with adaptive governance needs. The comparative analysis of Germany, France, and the United Kingdom reveals that the apparent paradox between codification and adaptation is being resolved through hybrid approaches that embed flexibility mechanisms within procedural frameworks. These findings challenge both the assumption that codification inevitably produces rigidity and the concern that adaptive governance necessarily undermines legal certainty.

The research contributes to administrative law theory by identifying the emergence of "adaptive codification"—an approach that preserves procedural values while enabling responsive governance. This concept bridges traditionally separate literatures on codification and adaptive governance, suggesting that procedural structure can facilitate rather than impede administrative adaptation when deliberately designed for contemporary governance challenges.

Theoretical and Practical Implications

For administrative law theory, this analysis suggests three implications. First, it demonstrates that the purpose of administrative procedure is evolving from controlling bureaucratic discretion toward structuring how discretion is exercised under uncertainty. Second, it challenges traditional distinctions between codified and uncodified systems, showing convergence around similar adaptive mechanisms despite different procedural architectures. Third, it suggests the need for more nuanced theories of administrative legitimacy that acknowledge the value of both procedural regularity and administrative responsiveness.

For policymakers and legal reformers, the analysis suggests several practical approaches to administrative law development:

First, design procedural frameworks that differentiate between routine and adaptive contexts rather than imposing uniform requirements. France's CRPA demonstrates how codification can incorporate context-sensitive procedural tracks that maintain core values while enabling flexibility where needed.

Second, develop formalized mechanisms for procedural learning and updating. Germany's approach to norm-specification through structured consultation and regular review cycles shows how administrative procedures can evolve without sacrificing legal certainty.

Third, recognize diverse administrative instruments while subjecting them to proportionate procedural requirements. The formalization of soft law instruments in France and experimental regulation in the UK illustrates how procedural values can be maintained while expanding administrative toolkits.

Fourth, strengthen oversight mechanisms that focus on procedural integrity rather than substantive outcomes. Independent review bodies, structured reporting requirements, and specialized courts can maintain accountability while enabling innovation in administrative methods.

© 2025. International Journal of Legal Science and Innovation [ISSN 2581-9453]

Future Research Directions

This study suggests several promising directions for future research. First, empirical studies examining how administrative officials experience procedural requirements in adaptive contexts could provide insights into practical implementation challenges. Second, research on how procedural innovations diffuse across legal systems could illuminate the mechanisms of legal transplantation in administrative law. Third, longitudinal studies tracking how administrative procedures evolve in response to governance challenges could provide valuable insights into the dynamic relationship between law and administration.

The paradox of codification in the age of adaptive governance ultimately reveals not an irreconcilable contradiction but a productive tension driving administrative law evolution. By developing procedural frameworks that structure rather than prevent adaptation, administrative systems are demonstrating how rule of law values can be preserved while enabling the flexible, responsive governance that contemporary challenges require.

*****

© 2025. International Journal of Legal Science and Innovation [ISSN 2581-9453]

IX. REFERENCES

1. Abbott, K. W., & Snidal, D. (2009). The governance triangle: Regulatory standards institutions and the shadow of the state. In W. Mattli & N. Woods (Eds.), *The politics of global regulation* (pp. 44-88). Princeton University Press.
2. Auby, J.-B. (2019). Adaptive law and complexity in administrative systems. *European Journal of Law Reform*, *21*(1), 76-98.
3. Béchillon, D. de. (2020). L'état d'urgence sanitaire: analyse juridique d'un régime d'exception. *Recueil Dalloz*, 16, 891-897.
4. Caillosse, J. (2014). Le droit administratif contre la performance publique? *AJDA*, 3, 195-211.
5. Chevallier, J. (2021). Le droit souple. In J.-B. Auby (Ed.), *Le droit en action* (pp. 25-40). LGDJ.
6. Competition and Markets Authority. (2019, November 16). The CMA's approach to disruptive innovation.
7. Cosens, B. A., & Craig, R. K. (2018). Adaptive governance and resilience: The Columbia River Basin. In R. Lyster & R. R. M. Verchick (Eds.), *Research handbook on climate disaster law* (pp. 147-162). Edward Elgar.
8. Craig, P. (2004). The common law, shared power and judicial review. *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*, *24*(2), 237-257.
9. de Búrca, G., & Scott, J. (Eds.). (2006). *Law and new governance in the EU and the US*. Hart Publishing.
10. Dorf, M. C., & Sabel, C. F. (1998). A constitution of democratic experimentalism. *Columbia Law Review*, *98*(2), 267-473.
11. Eifert, M. (2017). Regulierungsstrategien im Umgang mit sozialen Netzwerken. *Die Verwaltung*, *50*(3), 309-338.
12. Fisher, E. (2006). Unpacking the toolbox: Or why the public/private divide is important in EC environmental law. In M. Freedland & J.-B. Auby (Eds.), *The public law/private law divide* (pp. 215-242). Hart Publishing.
13. Fisher, E. (2007). *Risk regulation and administrative constitutionalism*. Hart Publishing.

14. Folke, C., Hahn, T., Olsson, P., & Norberg, J. (2005). Adaptive governance of social-ecological systems. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, *30*, 441-473.

15. Franzius, C. (2012). Modalitäten und Wirkungsfaktoren der Steuerung durch Recht. In W. Hoffmann-Riem, E. Schmidt-Aßmann, & A. Voßkuhle (Eds.), *Grundlagen des Verwaltungsrechts, Band I* (2nd ed., pp. 179-253). C.H. Beck.

16. Frison-Roche, M.-A. (2021). Régulation digitale: des outils juridiques nouveaux pour des enjeux sectoriels transformés. *La Semaine Juridique Edition Générale*, 12, 570-575.

17. Gärditz, K. F. (2021). Klima-Beschluss des BVerfG: Kritisches zu Dogmatik und Folgen. *Umwelt- und Planungsrecht*, *41*(8), 281-289.

18. Gordon, R., & Sandhurst, A. (2020, September 28). Review of the Coronavirus Act 2020. *UK Constitutional Law Association Blog*.

19. Harlow, C. (2006). Global administrative law: The quest for principles and values. *European Journal of International Law*, *17*(1), 187-214.

20. Harlow, C., & Rawlings, R. (2021). *Law and administration* (4th ed.). Cambridge University Press.

21. Jégouzo, Y. (2017). L'expertise dans une démocratie administrative. *Revue française d'administration publique*, *163*(3), 637-648.

22. King, J. (2020). The lockdown is lawful: Judicial review of coronavirus restrictions. *Law Quarterly Review*, *136*, 664-672.

23. Klafki, A. (2017). *Risiko und Recht: Risiken und Katastrophen im Spannungsfeld von Effektivität, demokratischer Legitimation und rechtsstaatlichen Grundsätzen am Beispiel von Pandemien*. Mohr Siebeck.

24. Marzal, T. (2021). Le climat et l'engagement de l'État. *Recueil Dalloz*, 30, 1597-1603.

25. Melleray, F. (2016). Le contrôle juridictionnel des actes de droit souple. *Revue française de droit administratif*, 4, 679-684.

26. Noguellou, R. (2020). Le droit administratif en temps de crise sanitaire. *Revue française de droit administratif*, 4, 593-600.

27. Pontier, J.-M. (2019). Codification et simplification. *Revue du droit public*, 6, 1499-1512.

28. Rixen, S. (2021). Gestaltungsoptionen des Parlaments und der Bundesländer bei der Bekämpfung der Corona-Pandemie. *Die Öffentliche Verwaltung*, *74*(5), 172-181.

29. Ruffert, M. (2021). The future of administrative law scholarship in Germany. In P. Cane, H. C. H. Hofmann, E. C. Ip, & P. L. Lindseth (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of comparative administrative law* (pp. 96-116). Oxford University Press.

30. Sabel, C. F., & Zeitlin, J. (2012). Experimentalist governance. In D. Levi-Faur (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of governance* (pp. 169-186). Oxford University Press.

31. Sauvé, J.-M. (2016). Le Code des relations entre le public et l'administration, une nouvelle étape pour l'administration de service. *Revue française d'administration publique*, *157*(1), 7-9.

32. Scheuerman, W. E. (2006). Emergency powers and the rule of law after 9/11. *Journal of Political Philosophy*, *14*(1), 61-84.

33. Schmidt-Aßmann, E. (2008). The internationalization of administrative relations as a challenge for administrative law scholarship. *German Law Journal*, *9*(11), 2061-2079.

34. Scotford, E., & Minas, S. (2019). Probing the hidden depths of climate law: Analysing national climate change legislation. *Review of European, Comparative & International Environmental Law*, *28*(1), 67-81.

35. Stelkens, U. (2018). Art. 35 VwVfG. In P. Stelkens, H. J. Bonk, & M. Sachs (Eds.), *Verwaltungsverfahrensgesetz* (9th ed.).

36. Voßkuhle, A. (2012). Neue Verwaltungsrechtswissenschaft. In W. Hoffmann-Riem, E. Schmidt-Aßmann, & A. Voßkuhle (Eds.), *Grundlagen des Verwaltungsrechts, Band I* (2nd ed., pp. 1-63). C.H. Beck.

37. Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and society* (G. Roth & C. Wittich, Eds.). University of California Press.

38. Yeung, K. (2013). Better regulation, administrative sanctions and constitutional values. *Legal Studies*, *33*(2), 312-339.

Legal Cases

39. *Association Les Amis de la Terre*, Conseil d'État, July 19, 2021, No. 427301.

40. *BVerwG 3 CN 2.21*, Federal Administrative Court, November 22, 2021.

41. *BVerwG 7 C 26.16*, Federal Administrative Court, January 25, 2018.

42. *Federal Constitutional Court*, 1 BvR 2656/18, March 24, 2021.

43. *Plan B Earth v. Secretary of State for Transport*, [2020] EWCA Civ 214.

44. *R (Bridges) v. Chief Constable of South Wales Police*, [2020] EWCA Civ 1058.

45. *R (Dolan) v. Secretary of State for Health*, [2020] EWCA Civ 1605.

46. *Société Fairvesta International*, Conseil d'État, 2016.

Legislative Sources

47. Climate Change Act 2008 (UK).

48. Code des relations entre le public et l'administration (France).

49. Coronavirus Act 2020 (UK).

50. Digital Economy Act 2017 (UK).

51. *Infektionsschutzgesetz* [Infection Protection Act] (Germany).

52. *Loi énergie-climat* [Energy and Climate Law] 2019 (France).

53. *Netzwerkdurchsetzungsgesetz* [Network Enforcement Act] (Germany).

54. *Verwaltungsverfahrensgesetz* [Administrative Procedure Act] (Germany).

*****

© 2025. International Journal of Legal Science and Innovation [ISSN 2581-9453]