



# COMPARISON OF INDONESIAN AND PHILIPPINE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION REGULATIONS IN DEALING WITH AI DISRUPTION IN ASEAN

Syahda Azzahro<sup>1</sup>, Aminullah<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Departement Of Public Administration, Universitas Yudharta Pasuruan, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup> Departement Of Public Administration, Universitas Yudharta Pasuruan, Indonesia

Email : [Syahdaazzahro7@gmail.com](mailto:Syahdaazzahro7@gmail.com) <sup>1</sup>, [Aminullah@Yudharta.Ac.Id](mailto:Aminullah@Yudharta.Ac.Id) <sup>2</sup>

E-Issn : 3109-9777

Received: November 2025

Accepted: November 2025

Published: January 2026

## Abstract :

*The Adoption Of Artificial Intelligence (Ai) In Public Administration Has Intensified Across Southeast Asia, Raising Critical Challenges Related To Ethics, Accountability, And Regulatory Readiness. This Study Compares Indonesian And Philippine Public Administration Regulations In Responding To Ai-Driven Disruption Within The Asean Context. Using A Qualitative-Comparative Case Study Approach, The Research Analyzes Key Policy Documents, Including Indonesia's Presidential Regulation No. 82 Of 2023 And The Philippines' National Ai Strategy Roadmap 2.0, Complemented By Data From The Government Ai Readiness Index 2025. The Findings Reveal Divergent Governance Models. Indonesia Adopts A Centralized And Security-Oriented Approach, Emphasizing Data Sovereignty And Cybersecurity Through Strong State Control But Relying Largely On Non-Binding Ai Ethics Guidelines. In Contrast, The Philippines Demonstrates A More Networked And Rights-Based Governance Model, Integrating Ai Ethics Into Operational Regulations And Advancing Algorithmic Impact Assessment Mechanisms Through Institutional Collaboration. The Study Concludes That The Primary Distinction Lies Not In Ethical Awareness But In The Degree Of Institutionalization Of Accountability And Transparency Mechanisms. This Research Contributes Original Insight By Situating National Ai Governance Models Within The Strategic Dynamics Of Asean's 2026 Leadership, Highlighting How Tensions Between Digital Sovereignty And Regional Interoperability Shape The Future Of Ethical And Accountable Ai Governance In Southeast Asian Public Administration.*

**Keywords :** Artificial Intelligence (Ai), Public Administration, Ai Governance, Indonesia, Philippines, Regulatory Comparison, Asean, Algorithmic Accountability.

## INTRODUCTION

Adoption Of Artificial Intelligence (Artificial Intelligence/Ai) In The Global Public Sector Has Reached A Crucial Point By 2026. This Technology Is No Longer Just An Experimental Tool, But Has Transformed Into The Main Engine Driving Bureaucratic Efficiency. This Condition Is Driven By The Government's Need To Manage Big Data To Provide More Predictive, Personalized, And Responsive Public Services. (Mergel, Edelman, & Haug, 2019) Affirms That Digital Transformation In The Public Sector Demands Fundamental Changes In Organizational Culture As Well As Legal Frameworks So That Ai-Based Automation Does Not Harm The Principles Of Social Justice And Public Accountability. However, The Application Of Ai Also Poses Serious



Challenges, Especially Regarding Transparency And Accountability For Decisions Generated By Algorithmic Systems.

In The Southeast Asian Region, The Urgency Of Ai Governance Is Getting Stronger With The Issuance Of Asean Guide On Ai Governance And Ethics. This Document Affirms The Regional Commitment To Ensure The Ethical, Safe, And Publicly-Interest-Oriented Use Of Ai. This Momentum Has Become Even More Strategic With The Election Of The Philippines As Asean Chair In 2026. The Philippines' Leadership Is Expected To Accelerate Cross-Border Digital Collaboration While Encouraging The Formation Of A More Uniform Ai Ethical Standard In The Region. Asean Secretariat 2024 (Governance, 2024) Emphasized That Regulatory Alignment Among Member Countries Is An Important Prerequisite To Prevent The Digital Divide That Has The Potential To Hinder Regional Economic Integration.

In This Context, Indonesia And The Philippines Occupy A Strategic Position As The Main Actors Of Digital Transformation In Southeast Asia. Indonesia, As The Country With The Largest Population In The Region, Has Great Ambitions Through The Golden Indonesia Vision 2045 Which Relies Heavily On The Effectiveness Of Digital-Based Public Administration. Meanwhile, The Philippines Has Shown Significant Progress In Digital Talent Readiness As Well As Policy Flexibility Through National Ai Strategy Roadmap 2.0 Coordinated By Department Of Information And Communications Technology (DICT 2024). Both Countries Are Archipelagic Countries With Relatively Similar Administrative Complexities, But Adopt Different Policy Approaches In Response To Ai Technology Disruptions (Release, 2024).

These Differences Are Evident In The Regulatory And Institutional Foundations. Indonesia Tends To Emphasize Aspects Of Cybersecurity And Data Sovereignty Through Strengthening The Role Of The State Cyber And Cryptography Agency (BSSN) And The Implementation Of Law Number 27 Of 2022 Concerning Personal Data Protection. Instead, The Philippines Is More Open To International Collaboration And Networked Governance By Involving The Private Sector And Academia In The Development Of The National Ai Ecosystem. This Comparison Is Important To Assess The Extent To Which Both Countries Are Institutionally Prepared In The Face Of Ai Ethical Risks, Such As Algorithmic Bias And Privacy Violations, That Have The Potential To Arise In Day-To-Day Public Administration Practices. (Abdullah, Durand, & Moonti, 2025).

This Research Has High Relevance Considering The Risk Of Using Technology Without An Adequate Regulatory Framework. In The Context Of The Digital Innovation Race, The Protection Of Citizens' Rights Is Often Marginalized For The Sake Of Technocratic Efficiency. Therefore, This Study Aims To Critically Dissect The Regulatory Readiness And Public Administration Capacity Of Indonesia And The Philippines In Managing Ai Ethically And Accountably. The Results Of This Study Are Expected To Make A Conceptual And Practical Contribution To The Formulation Of Ai Governance Policies At The National And Regional Levels, Especially Ahead Of The 2026

Asean Strategic Agenda.

## **RESEARCH METHOD**

This Study Uses A Qualitative-Comparative Approach With A Descriptive Case Study Method. The Main Data Source Was Obtained Through The Analysis Of Policy Documents (Documentary Analysis) Which Includes Presidential Regulation Number 82 Of 2023 (Indonesia) And National Ai Strategy Roadmap 2.0 (Philippines). The Researchers Also Used Secondary Data From The Report Government Ai Readiness Index 2025 Published By Oxford Insights (Iida, Grau, & Neill, 2025) To Compare The Government Pillar Readiness Score And Data. In Addition, This Research Refers To Official News From Government Portals Such As Setkab.Go.Id (Indonesia) And Dict.Gov.Ph (Philippines) To Obtain The Latest Implementation Data Until Early 2026. Data Analysis Techniques Are Carried Out Through A Process Data Reduction, Data Display, And Drawing Conclusions Based On Theory Digital Era Governance.

The Analysis Was Carried Out Using A Systematic Content Analysis Technique To Identify Key Variables Such As Accountability Structure, Algorithm Transparency, And Privacy Protection. The Researcher Compares The Data Horizontally To Find Patterns Of Divergence And Policy Convergence Between The Two Countries, Which Are Then Interpreted Through The Lens Of Digital Era Governance Theory To Answer The Challenges Of Public Administration In 2026 The Analysis Was Carried Out Using A Systematic Content Analysis Technique To Identify Key Variables Such As Accountability Structure, Algorithm Transparency, And Privacy Protection. The Researcher Compares The Data Horizontally To Find Patterns Of Divergence And Policy Convergence Between The Two Countries, Which Are Then Interpreted Through The Lens Of Digital Era Governance Theory To Answer The Challenges Of Public Administration In 2026.

## **FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

### **Ai Policy Profile**

Indonesia's Current Ai Administration System Centers On Integrated Services Through The Ina Digital Portal, The Backbone Of The National Digital Government Transformation. Ina Digital Is Designed To Integrate Various Services Across Ministries And Agencies Into A Single, Integrated Ecosystem, In Line With The Mandate Of The Electronic-Based Government System (Spbe). This Approach Reflects The Platform Government Strategy, Where The State Serves As Both The Provider Of Core Digital Infrastructure And The Controller Of The Public Service Architecture. The Primary Focus Of This Integration Is To Reduce Sectoral Egos Between Agencies And Create Consistent Interoperability Of Services For Citizens. From The Perspective Of Digital-Era Governance Theory, Digital Service Integration Is Seen As An Instrument For Improving Efficiency, Service Consistency, And Reducing Bureaucratic Fragmentation. However, The Effectiveness Of This Integration Depends Heavily On Cross-Agency Coordination Capacity And Institutional Agreements On Data

Standards And Shared Governance. Institutionally, Ai Governance In Indonesia Demonstrates A Relatively Fragmented Yet Strategic Division Of Authority. The Ministry Of Communication And Informatics Serves As The Primary Regulator Of The Telecommunications Sector And Digital Transformation Policies, Including The Development Of Ai Ethics Guidelines, While The National Cyber And Crypto Agency (Bssn) Is Mandated To Secure Digital Infrastructure And Ensure National Cyber Resilience. This Configuration Indicates That Ai In Indonesia Is Positioned Not Only As An Instrument Of Administrative Innovation But Also As A Strategic State Asset That Must Be Managed Within A National Security Framework. Literature On Digital Sovereignty And The Regulatory State Indicates That This Type Of Role Division Is Common In Countries That Prioritize Stability And Security As Primary Prerequisites For Adopting Advanced Technology (Kementerian Komunikasi Dan Informatika, 2018; Republik Indonesia, 2023).

Based On Data From The Government Ai Readiness Index 2025, Indonesia Has A Relative Advantage In Terms Of Public Data Availability And Basic Digital Infrastructure, Which Are Essential Prerequisites For The Development And Implementation Of Ai In The Public Sector. However, The Same Report Also Highlights Significant Challenges In Cross-Sectoral Coordination And Policy Consistency, Primarily Due To A Hierarchical Bureaucratic Structure And Persistent Institutional Silos. Within The Framework Of State Capacity Theory, This Situation Indicates That Technical Capacity Has Not Been Fully Balanced With Coordinative Capacity, Resulting In Underutilization Of Ai's Potential To Support Cross-Sectoral Decision-Making. In Contrast, The Philippines Has Adopted A More Open And Collaborative Ai Policy Approach Under The Coordination Of The Department Of Information And Communications Technology (DICT). The Philippine Government Is Actively Building An Ai Innovation Ecosystem By Placing Collaboration Between Government, Academia, And The Private Sector As A Core Element Of Its Policy. The Initiative To Establish The National Center For Ai Research (NCAIR) Is Projected As A Bridging Institution Connecting Academic Research, Industry Needs, And Public Policy Interests. This Approach Aligns With The Theory Of Networked Governance, Which Emphasizes The Importance Of Networks Of Non-State Actors In Developing Adaptive And Sustainable Technology Policies (Iida Et Al., 2025).

In Terms Of Operational Regulations, The Philippines Is Considered More Prepared In Terms Of Regulatory Agility, Particularly As It Has Begun Formulating And Implementing Specific Ai Guidelines For Civil Servants Since The End Of 2024. These Guidelines Serve Not Only As Ethical Norms But Also As A Reference For Bureaucratic Practices In The Use Of Automated Systems And Ai In Public Services. Thus, While Indonesia Follows A Centralized And Integrated Top-Down Approach, The Philippines More Closely Reflects A Networked Governance Model That Connects The Bureaucracy With Ai Centers Of Excellence In The Private And Academic Sectors. Contemporary Ai Governance Literature Assesses That This Networked Model Tends To Be More

Responsive To Technological Dynamics, Although It Demands A High Level Of Cross-Actor Coordination.

### **Regulatory And Institutional**

Legally, Indonesia Already Has A Strong Normative Framework Through Law Number 27 Of 2022 Concerning Personal Data Protection (Pdp Law), Which Regulates The Legal Principles Of Data Processing, The Rights Of Data Subjects, And The Obligations Of Data Controllers And Processors. However, When Applied To The Context Of Artificial Intelligence, The Indonesian Legal Framework Is Still Dominated By Advisory Instruments, Particularly Through Circular Letter Of The Minister Of Communication And Information Technology Number 9 Of 2023 Concerning The Ethics Of Artificial Intelligence. This Instrument Does Not Create Binding Administrative Obligations, Such As Algorithm Audits, Impact Reporting Obligations, Or Sanctions For Ai Ethics Violations. The Regulatory Governance Literature Refers To This Situation As Ethics Without Enforcement, Where Ethical Principles Serve As Moral Guidelines But Have Not Been Institutionalized In Performance Assessment Mechanisms And Bureaucratic Oversight. Within The Theoretical Framework Of The Rule Of Law And Good Governance, This Situation Creates A Gap Between General Legal Norms And The Specific Regulatory Needs Of Ai That Directly Impact Citizens' Rights. In Contrast, The Philippines Demonstrates A More Institutionalized Approach In Integrating Ai Ethics Principles Into Public Organizational Structures. Through Coordination Between The Department Of Information And Communications Technology (Dict) And The National Privacy Commission (Npc), Npc Advisory No. 2024-04 Affirms That The Data Privacy Act Applies To The Use Of Ai That Processes Personal Data, Including During The Training And Testing Stages Of The System. This Approach Reflects A Rights-Based Governance Model, Where The Protection Of Individual Rights Is The Primary Entry Point For Ai Governance. By Linking Ai To Legal Privacy Obligations, The Philippines Strengthens Accountability Mechanisms Without Having To Wait For Comprehensive Ai Legislation. Several Philippine Government Policy Documents And Draft Guidelines Emphasize That The Use Of Ai In The Public Sector Should Be Assessed Based On Its Impact On Citizen Rights, Fairness Of Service, And The Risk Of Discrimination, Allowing Ai Ethics To Serve As An Evaluative Criterion In Bureaucratic Practice, Rather Than Simply A Declaration Of Values (Jdih, 2022; Laurie E. Locascio, 2023).

In Terms Of Substantive Ethics, Both Indonesia And The Philippines Still Face Serious Challenges Related To Potential Algorithmic Bias, Particularly In Social Services, Aid Targeting, And Administrative Classification Systems. Recent Studies Have Shown That Algorithmic Bias In The Public Sector Often Stems From Non-Neutral Historical Data And Model Designs That Ignore Local Social Context, Potentially Reinforcing Existing Inequalities. Therefore, The Existence Of Ethical Principles Without Impact-Based Evaluation Mechanisms Is Considered Insufficient To Prevent The Reproduction Of Injustice Through Ai Systems.

**Table : 1 Comparison Of Artificial Intelligence Regulation And Governance Framework In Indonesia And The Philippines**

Indicator	Indonesia	Philippines
Key Regulations	Presidential Regulation No. 82 Of 2023 (National Digital)	National Ai Strategy Roadmap 2.0 (Naisr)
Legal Status Of Ai	Ethical/ Appealing (Se Minister Of Communication And Information No. 9/2023)	A Strategic Framework Towards Binding Regulation
Strategic Focus	Consolidation Of Services Through Ina Digital	Research Innovation Through The Center For Ai Research (Cair)
Research Approach	Centralistic (Government & Soes)	Networked Governance (Government & Private)
Risk Mitigation	Personal Data Protection Law (Pdp Law)	Algorithmic Impact Assessment (Aia)

The Philippines Is Relatively A Step Ahead, Having Begun Pushing For The Implementation Of Algorithmic Impact Assessment (Aia) Or A Comparable Impact Assessment Mechanism For Government Ai Projects, Particularly Those With A High Impact On Public Rights And Services. While The Institutionalization Of Aia In The Philippines Is Still Evolving Through A Combination Of Npc Advisories, Draft Dict Guidelines, And National Policy Discourse, This Approach Reflects A Shift Toward Impact-Based Regulation, Which Assesses Ai Not Only For Its Technical Efficiency But Also For Its Social And Administrative Consequences. This Approach Aligns With International Practices Recommended By The Oecd, Unesco, And The European Union For Managing High-Risk Ai In The Public Sector. In Contrast, The Absence Of Mandatory Aia Or A Similar Mechanism In Indonesia Means That Ai Ethics Evaluations Remain Heavily Reliant On Agency Discretion And Voluntary Compliance. From A Good Governance Perspective, This Situation Has The Potential To Undermine The Principles Of Accountability And Procedural Fairness, As Citizens Lack Assurance That Ai Systems Affecting Their Rights Have Undergone Adequate Risk And Impact Assessments. Therefore, This Comparison Confirms That The Primary Difference Between Indonesia And The Philippines Lies Not In Awareness Of Ai Ethics, But Rather In The Degree To Which These Ethics Are Institutionalized Within An Oversight And

Accountable Administrative Mechanism.(European Parliament And Council Of The European Union, 2024; Thagard, 2021; Ubaldi & Zapata, 2024).

### **Algorithm Accountability And Transparency Challenges**

The Implementation Of Artificial Intelligence In Public Administration In Indonesia And The Philippines Faces Significant Challenges In Terms Of Algorithmic Accountability And Transparency. In The Indonesian Context, The Integration Of Data And Services Through Ina Digital Promises To Increase The Efficiency And Consistency Of Public Services, But At The Same Time, It Poses Serious Risks Related To The Use Of Black-Box Algorithms. When The System's Decision-Making Logic Cannot Be Adequately Explained To The Public, Ai Has The Potential To Become A New Source Of Administrative Power That Is Difficult To Monitor. The Literature On Algorithmic Governance Emphasizes That Without Transparency And Clarity Of Decision Rationales, Administrative Legitimacy Can Be Eroded, Particularly In Public Services That Directly Impact Citizens' Rights And Well-Being. This Situation Is Exacerbated By The Absence Of Binding Regulations Requiring Algorithm Audits Or Impact Assessments Of Ai Systems In Indonesian Public Administration. While Ai Ethics Guidelines Exist, The Lack Of Legal Obligations Regarding Model Documentation, Bias Evaluation, And Review Mechanisms For Automated Decisions Limits The Scope For Appeals For Citizens Harmed By Ai-Based Decisions. From The Perspective Of Procedural Justice And Good Governance Theories, The Absence Of A Clear Appeal Mechanism Has The Potential To Result In Procedural Injustice, As Citizens Lack Access To Understand, Challenge, Or Correct Administrative Decisions Made By Automated Systems. In Contrast, The Philippines Seeks To Mitigate The Risks Of Black Box Governance Through The Implementation Of A Mandatory Algorithmic Impact Assessment (Aia) Within The Operational Policy Framework For Ai Use In The Public Sector. Through A Combination Of Policies Developed By The Department Of Information And Communications Technology (Dict) And Strengthened Governance By The National Privacy Commission (Npc), Government Agencies Adopting Automation Technologies Are Required To Assess The Risks, Impacts, And Ethical Implications Of Ai Systems Before And During Implementation. While This Approach Has Not Yet Been Institutionalized In A Comprehensive Ai Law, The Practice Of Aia Is Positioned As An Administrative Prerequisite For High-Risk Ai Uses, Particularly Those That Impact Citizen Rights (Busuioc, 2021; Laurie E. Locascio, 2023).

The Implementation Of The Aia In The Philippines Provides Greater Transparency For The Public To Understand The Parameters, Objectives, And Potential Risks Used By Machines In Making Administrative Decisions. In The Theory Of Trust-Based Digital Governance, Transparency Regarding The Workings Of Automated Systems Is A Key Factor In Building Public Trust In Digital Bureaucracy. By Providing Documentation Of Impacts And Risk Assessments, The Government Not Only Enhances Internal Accountability But Also Strengthens The External Legitimacy Of Digital Policies In The Eyes Of Citizens.

This Comparison Confirms That The Main Difference Between Indonesia And The Philippines In Algorithmic Accountability Lies Not In The Level Of Ai Ethics Awareness, But Rather In The Institutionalization Of Impact-Based Evaluation Mechanisms. Indonesia Still Relies On Normative Compliance And Voluntary Ethical Principles, While The Philippines Is Moving Toward An Impact-Based Governance Model That Makes Algorithmic Impact Assessment An Integral Part Of The Administrative Process. The Literature On Ai Governance 2020–2026 Suggests That Countries That Adopt Impact Assessment Mechanisms Earlier Tend To Be Better Prepared To Deal With Administrative Disputes And Crises Of Public Trust Resulting From Automated System Failures (Alon-Barkat & Busuioc, 2023).

### **Digital Diplomacy And Asean Leadership 2026**

At The Regional Level, Asean Has Adopted The Asean Guide On Ai Governance And Ethics As A Common Reference For Member States. This Guide Serves As A Normative Coordination Instrument That Promotes Alignment Of Principles Without Eliminating National Regulatory Sovereignty. In Regime Complex Theory, Such Regional Guidelines Help Lower Coordination Costs And Provide A Common Language For Cross-Border Technology Governance (Asean, 2024; Ubaldi & Zapata, 2024).

The Philippines' Leadership As Asean Chair In 2026 Provides A Strategic Position To Promote The Operationalization Of These Ai Guidelines. The Philippines' Focus On Ai Ethics And Governance Provides An Opportunity To Strengthen The Harmonization Of Regional Standards, Particularly In The Context Of Reducing The Digital Capacity Gap Among Member States. Meanwhile, Indonesia, As The Largest Digital Economy In The Region, Has A Significant Interest In Ensuring That Such Harmonization Does Not Diminish State Control Over Cybersecurity And Data Sovereignty. The Differences In Approach Between Indonesia's Protectionist Tendencies And The Philippines' More Collaborative Approach Reflect The Tension Between Digital Sovereignty And Regional Interoperability. However, The Global Ai Governance Literature Suggests That A Secure Interoperability-Based Compromise—Harmonizing Risk Principles And Procedures Without Standardizing National Laws—Is An Increasingly Accepted Approach Internationally (Asean, 2024, 2026).

### **CONCLUSION**

Digital Transformation In Southeast Asia Through The Adoption Of Artificial Intelligence Is An Inevitability That Demands Public Administration Regulations That Are Not Only Normatively Robust But Also Adaptive To Technological Dynamics. A Comparison Between Indonesia And The Philippines Demonstrates That, While Both Are Key Players In The Asean Digital Landscape, There Are Fundamental Differences In Institutional Readiness And Governance Approaches. Indonesia Has The Advantage Of Having Large-Scale Public Datasets Through The Spbe Framework And The Integration Of National Services, But Still Faces Serious Challenges In The Form Of Rigid Cross-Sectoral Coordination And Non-Binding Ai Ethics Regulations.

In Contrast, The Philippines Exhibits A More Agile Networked Governance Model By Integrating Ai Ethics Principles Into Performance Evaluation Mechanisms And The Governance Of Public Organizations. Global Ai Governance Literature Emphasizes That The Success Of Ai Implementation In The Public Sector Is Measured Not Solely By Technological Sophistication, But By The Ability Of Public Administration Regulations To Protect Citizens' Rights From The Risks Of Algorithmic Bias, Opaque Decision-Making, And Privacy Violations. In The Asean Context, The Synergy Between National Data Sovereignty And International Collaboration Is A Crucial Prerequisite For Modern Bureaucracies To Address The Moral And Legal Dilemmas Posed By Machine Intelligence Without Compromising Procedural Fairness And The Quality Of Public Services.

## REFERENCES

- Abdullah, C., Durand, N., & Moonti, R. M. (2025). *Transformasi Digital Dan Hak Atas Privasi : Tinjauan Kritis Pelaksanaan Uu Perlindungan Data Pribadi ( Pdp ) Tahun 2022 Di Era Big Data. 2.*
- Alon-Barkat, S., & Busuioc, M. (2023). Human-Ai Interactions In Public Sector Decision Making: “Automation Bias” And “Selective Adherence” To Algorithmic Advice. *Journal Of Public Administration Research And Theory*, 33(1), 153–169. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/muac007>
- Asean. (2024). Asean Guide On Ai Governance And Ethics Contents. *Association Of Southeast Asian Nations (Asean)*, 1–87. Retrieved From [https://asean.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/02/Asean-Guide-On-Ai-Governance-And-Ethics\\_Beautified\\_201223\\_V2.Pdf](https://asean.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/02/Asean-Guide-On-Ai-Governance-And-Ethics_Beautified_201223_V2.Pdf)
- Asean, P. (2026). *About The Asean 2026 Philippine Chairship Navigating Our Future , Together. 2026.*
- Busuioc, M. (2021). Accountable Artificial Intelligence: Holding Algorithms To Account. *Public Administration Review*, 81(5), 825–836. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13293>
- European Parliament And Council Of The European Union. (2024). Regulation (Eu) 2024/1689 Of The European Parliament And Of The Council Of 13 June 2024 Laying Down Harmonised Rules On Artificial Intelligence And Amending Regulations (Ec) No 300/2008, (Eu) No 167/2013, (Eu) No 168/2013, (Eu) 2018/858, (Eu) 2018/1139 An. *Official Journal Of The European Union*, 1689(3), 1–144. Retrieved From <http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2024/1689/oj>
- Governance, A. (2024). *Asean Guide On Ai Governance And Ethics.*
- Iida, K., Grau, G., & Neill, M. O. (2025). *Government Ai Readiness Index 2025.* 1–70.
- Jdih. (2022). Uu Ri No. 27 Tahun 2022. *Undang-Undang Pdp, (016999)*, 457–483. Kementerian Komunikasi Dan Informatika. (2018). Peraturan Presiden Nomor 95 Tahun 2018 Tentang Sistem Pemerintahan Berbasis Elektronik. *Menteri Hukum Dan Hak Asasi Manusia Republik Indonesia*, 110.
- Laurie E. Locascio. (2023). Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Nist Ai 100-1

- Artificial Intelligence Risk Management. *Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework (Ai Rmf 1.0)*, 100–101.
- Mergel, I., Edelman, N., & Haug, N. (2019). Defining Digital Transformation: Results From Expert Interviews. *Government Information Quarterly*, 36(4), 101385. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2019.06.002>
- Release, L. (2024). *National Artificial Intelligence Strategy*. 0.
- Republik Indonesia. (2023). Peraturan Presiden Republik Indonesia Nomor 82 Tahun 2023 Tentang Percepatan Transformasi Digital Dan Keterpaduan Layanan Digital Nasional. *Peraturan Presiden Republik Indonesia*, (132281), 1–3. Retrieved From <https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/details/273981/perpres-no-82-tahun-2023>
- Thagard, P. (2021). The Ethics Of Artificial Intelligence. *Bots And Beasts*, (November), 225–248. <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/14102.003.0010>
- Ubaldi, B.-C., & Zapata, R. (2024). Governing With Artificial Intelligence. Are Governments Ready? *Oecd Artificial Intelligence Papers*, 20(20), 1–5. Retrieved From <http://www.oecd.org/termsandconditions>.