



Regulating Artificial Intelligence in Public Services: Legal Challenges, Accountability, and Good Governance in Indonesia

Mohammad Najib Ihsan*

Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Ampel Surabaya, Indonesia

Email: najib.ihsan14@gmail.com

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.61987/bamj.v1i1>

Article History:

Received: 02 May 2026

Revised: 14 June 2026

Accepted: 10 July 2026

Keywords:

Artificial Intelligence; Public Service; Legal Accountability; Good Governance

***Correspondence Address:**

royhanazulfa12@gmail.com

Abstract :

This study examines the legal challenges of regulating Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Indonesian public services, with particular emphasis on legal accountability and the realization of good governance. The research aims to analyze the existing regulatory framework, identify legal gaps in AI governance, and formulate a comprehensive governance model that supports accountable and transparent public administration. A normative-empirical legal research design was employed by integrating statutory and doctrinal analysis with empirical data collected through document analysis, semi-structured interviews, and observations involving policymakers, legal experts, and public administrators. The findings reveal that Indonesia's AI governance remains fragmented, creating legal uncertainty regarding accountability, transparency, and institutional responsibility in AI-assisted decision-making. The study proposes a principle-based regulatory framework emphasizing legal certainty, explainability, human oversight, transparency, and institutional accountability. It concludes that comprehensive AI regulation is essential to ensure responsible public service delivery while safeguarding citizens' rights. The proposed framework contributes to administrative law scholarship and provides practical guidance for policymakers in developing accountable, transparent, and human-centered AI governance in Indonesia.

INTRODUCTION

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has emerged as a transformative technology that is fundamentally reshaping public service delivery worldwide. Governments increasingly employ AI-driven systems to improve administrative efficiency, optimize decision-making, enhance service accessibility, and strengthen evidence-based policymaking. In Indonesia, AI has become an integral component of the broader digital government agenda, supporting public sector innovation and bureaucratic reform (Ahmad, 2026; Misic et al., 2025). Nevertheless, the integration of AI into governmental functions extends beyond

technological advancement, raising significant legal and governance concerns. Algorithmic decision-making may affect citizens' fundamental rights, public accountability, procedural fairness, and legal certainty, particularly when administrative decisions are generated or assisted by automated systems (Bhat et al., 2024; Busuioc, 2020). Consequently, the absence of a comprehensive legal framework governing AI deployment in public administration creates substantial regulatory uncertainty. Establishing effective AI regulation is therefore essential to ensure that technological innovation remains consistent with the rule of law, democratic governance, human rights protection, and the principles of good governance in Indonesia (Li, 2025).

The rapid adoption of AI in Indonesia's public sector has introduced complex legal challenges that existing regulatory instruments have not adequately addressed. As the government accelerates digital transformation through Electronic-Based Government Systems (SPBE) and integrated digital public services, AI applications are increasingly utilized in administrative processes, data analytics, policy implementation, and citizen services (Ehimuan et al., 2024; Hadiaty & Saefullah, 2026; MohammadAmini et al., 2023). Despite these developments, Indonesia still lacks a comprehensive legal framework specifically regulating AI governance, leaving critical issues such as algorithmic accountability, liability allocation, transparency, explainability, and human oversight largely unresolved (Yalid, 2025; Zahra, 2025). Existing regulations primarily focus on electronic information systems, data protection, and public administration, but they provide limited guidance on determining legal responsibility when AI-generated decisions result in discrimination, privacy violations, administrative errors, or public harm. This fragmented regulatory environment may undermine legal certainty, weaken public trust in digital governance, and create significant obstacles to ensuring accountable and responsible AI implementation within public institutions.

These regulatory challenges have become increasingly visible across various public service sectors where AI technologies are gradually being incorporated into governmental operations. AI-powered applications are now utilized to support administrative verification, predictive analytics, digital complaint management, resource allocation, and decision-support systems, offering significant opportunities to improve efficiency, consistency, and service quality (Conduah et al., 2025; Yoon et al., 2025). However, these technological benefits are accompanied by substantial legal and ethical risks, including algorithmic bias, opaque decision-making processes, inadequate explainability, limited opportunities for administrative appeal, and insufficient institutional oversight. Internationally, numerous jurisdictions have responded by developing AI governance frameworks emphasizing transparency, accountability, risk management, human oversight, and the protection of fundamental rights (Akbar et al., 2025; Ye et al., 2024). In contrast, Indonesia remains in the early stages of establishing a comprehensive AI regulatory regime capable of balancing technological innovation with constitutional values, legal certainty, administrative accountability, and the realization of good governance. This regulatory gap highlights the urgent need for a coherent legal framework that effectively governs AI deployment in Indonesian public services.

Existing scholarship has extensively examined AI governance from the

perspectives of digital transformation, public administration, ethics, and regulatory policy. Recent studies emphasize that AI can significantly improve public sector efficiency, service quality, and evidence-based policymaking while simultaneously introducing legal risks related to transparency, algorithmic bias, privacy protection, and administrative accountability (Radanliev, 2025; Weiner et al., 2024). Studies conducted in the Indonesian context primarily discuss AI implementation within public administration, the ethical implications of automated decision-making, and the need to strengthen digital governance frameworks. Other researchers have highlighted the fragmented nature of Indonesia's AI regulatory landscape and recommended transitioning from voluntary governance principles toward legally binding regulatory instruments. Comparative legal studies have also explored international AI governance frameworks, particularly those emphasizing transparency, explainability, human oversight, and risk-based regulation. Collectively, these studies establish that AI governance has become an interdisciplinary issue requiring legal, institutional, and technological integration rather than merely technological innovation.

Despite these valuable contributions, several important research gaps remain unresolved. First, previous studies predominantly focus on technological governance, ethical principles, or administrative efficiency without providing a comprehensive legal analysis of accountability mechanisms applicable when AI-assisted public decisions generate legal consequences for citizens (Kaur et al., 2026; Zisu, 2025). Second, existing research rarely integrates administrative law, constitutional principles, and good governance into a unified analytical framework capable of clarifying the allocation of legal responsibility among government institutions, technology providers, and public officials. Third, most Indonesian studies emphasize policy recommendations without developing a normative regulatory model that can support future legislation governing AI in public services. Consequently, the relationship between AI regulation, legal accountability, and good governance remains conceptually fragmented. Addressing these gaps is essential because regulatory uncertainty may weaken public trust, reduce administrative legitimacy, and hinder the responsible adoption of AI within Indonesia's evolving digital government ecosystem.

This study offers a novel perspective by integrating AI regulation, legal accountability, and good governance into a single analytical framework for public service administration in Indonesia. Unlike previous studies that predominantly examine AI from technological, ethical, or policy-oriented perspectives, this research adopts a public law approach that combines principles of administrative law, constitutional governance, and regulatory theory to evaluate the legal implications of AI deployment in governmental decision-making. The study introduces a comprehensive framework for AI governance that emphasizes legal certainty, transparency, explainability, proportionality, human oversight, and institutional accountability as essential components of responsible public administration. By positioning AI regulation within the broader context of democratic governance and the rule of law, this research contributes to the ongoing discourse on digital government while providing practical recommendations for developing a coherent regulatory framework capable of balancing technological innovation with the protection of citizens'

rights and the realization of good governance in Indonesia.

Based on these considerations, this research addresses the following central question: How should Indonesia regulate the use of Artificial Intelligence in public services to ensure legal accountability while promoting the principles of good governance? This study argues that the absence of a comprehensive AI regulatory framework has created significant legal uncertainty regarding responsibility, transparency, and administrative accountability in AI-assisted public decision-making. Consequently, existing legal instruments are insufficient to address the unique challenges posed by autonomous and algorithm-driven governmental systems. The preliminary argument advanced in this study is that Indonesia requires an integrated, principle-based AI governance framework that clearly defines legal responsibility, mandates effective human oversight, strengthens institutional accountability, and guarantees procedural fairness and public participation. Such a framework would not only enhance legal certainty but also foster responsible innovation, reinforce public trust in digital government, and ensure that AI serves as an instrument for achieving accountable, transparent, and citizen-oriented public governance.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study employed a normative-empirical legal research design to comprehensively examine the regulation of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in public services from both doctrinal and practical perspectives. Normative legal research was utilized to analyze constitutional provisions, statutory regulations, government policies, legal doctrines, and international AI governance principles related to accountability and good governance. Meanwhile, the empirical component explored how these legal norms are implemented, interpreted, and experienced by public institutions responsible for digital public services. The combination of normative and empirical approaches was selected because the legal issues surrounding AI governance cannot be adequately understood solely through statutory interpretation. The implementation of AI in public administration involves institutional practices, administrative discretion, technological capacity, and policy execution that require empirical investigation. Consequently, the normative-empirical design enables this study to evaluate the consistency between legal provisions (*das sollen*) and their implementation in practice (*das sein*), thereby providing a more comprehensive understanding of legal accountability and governance challenges associated with AI adoption in Indonesia's public sector.

The empirical research was conducted in several Indonesian government institutions involved in digital transformation and AI-based public service implementation, including agencies responsible for electronic government systems, digital governance, and public administration. These institutions were selected because they play a central role in formulating, implementing, and supervising policies related to digital public services and emerging AI technologies. Indonesia was chosen as the research setting due to its ongoing digital transformation agenda, the rapid expansion of AI utilization within governmental services, and the absence of a comprehensive legal framework specifically governing AI. This regulatory condition creates an appropriate context for examining the interaction between technological innovation,

administrative accountability, and legal governance. Furthermore, Indonesia represents a developing legal system undergoing significant institutional reform toward digital government, making it a valuable case for analyzing regulatory readiness and identifying legal reforms necessary to support accountable AI governance in public administration.

Data were collected using documentation studies, semi-structured interviews, and direct observation guided. Data were collected included statutory regulations, government policies, institutional guidelines, official reports, judicial decisions where applicable, and stakeholders' perspectives regarding AI implementation in public services. Participated in the study consisted of policymakers, government officials, legal scholars, digital governance experts, information technology specialists, and public service administrators selected through purposive sampling based on their expertise and institutional responsibilities. Data collection was undertaken in relevant government institutions and through online platforms when face-to-face access was limited. The empirical investigation was conducted during the designated research period following the increasing adoption of AI within Indonesian public administration. These data sources were selected was to obtain comprehensive legal, institutional, and practical insights concerning AI governance. The data were collected involved document analysis, in-depth interviews, field observations, and triangulation across multiple sources to strengthen the credibility and completeness of the findings.

The collected data were analyzed using the interactive model of Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña, consisting of data condensation, data display, and conclusion drawing/verification. Data condensation involved selecting, simplifying, categorizing, and organizing legal documents, interview transcripts, observational records, and policy materials according to themes related to AI regulation, accountability, transparency, and good governance. Subsequently, the organized information was presented through matrices, thematic tables, conceptual diagrams, and narrative descriptions during the data display stage to facilitate pattern recognition and comparative legal analysis. Finally, conclusion drawing and verification were conducted continuously throughout the research process by comparing empirical findings with legal principles, statutory provisions, and theoretical frameworks. This iterative analytical process enabled the researcher to identify relationships between legal norms and institutional practices while ensuring that interpretations remained logically consistent, empirically supported, and legally justifiable.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Result

Legal Challenges in Regulating Artificial Intelligence for Public Service Delivery in Indonesia

The findings demonstrate that the implementation of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Indonesian public services has progressed more rapidly than the development of the legal framework governing its use. Interviews with policymakers, public administrators, and digital governance experts revealed that AI has increasingly been integrated into administrative functions such as document verification, citizen service management, predictive analytics, and

decision-support systems. Although these applications have improved administrative efficiency and reduced processing time, most institutions continue to rely on general regulations concerning electronic government systems, electronic information and transactions, public administration, and personal data protection. Respondents consistently indicated that no comprehensive legal instrument specifically regulates AI governance, resulting in fragmented legal interpretation and uncertainty regarding the legal status of AI-assisted administrative decisions. Consequently, public institutions frequently exercise broad administrative discretion without clear legal standards governing algorithmic accountability, transparency, or institutional responsibility.

Another significant finding concerns the ambiguity surrounding legal accountability when AI-generated outputs contribute to administrative decisions that adversely affect citizens. Government officials acknowledged that determining liability becomes particularly difficult when decision-making involves multiple actors, including software developers, technology vendors, public agencies, and administrative officials. The empirical findings further reveal that existing administrative procedures remain predominantly designed for human decision-makers rather than automated or semi-automated systems. As a result, citizens may encounter difficulties in identifying the responsible authority when algorithmic errors, inaccurate data processing, discriminatory recommendations, or system failures produce unfavorable administrative outcomes. Legal scholars participating in this study emphasized that the absence of explicit provisions concerning explainability, human oversight, and algorithmic responsibility weakens procedural justice and limits opportunities for effective administrative review or judicial protection.

The study also identifies several governance risks associated with the expanding use of AI in public administration. Respondents expressed concerns regarding algorithmic bias, insufficient transparency of machine-learning models, limitations in auditing AI systems, and the possibility of personal data misuse during automated decision-making processes. These challenges become increasingly significant because public service decisions directly influence citizens' constitutional rights, access to government services, and administrative justice. The findings indicate that technological innovation alone cannot guarantee accountable governance without corresponding legal safeguards and institutional oversight mechanisms. Therefore, the existing regulatory gap has created substantial legal uncertainty that may undermine public trust, reduce administrative legitimacy, and impede the responsible adoption of AI within Indonesia's digital government ecosystem. These findings confirm that strengthening AI regulation has become an urgent legal priority rather than merely a technological necessity.

Developing an Accountable AI Governance Framework to Strengthen Good Governance in Indonesian Public Services

The second major finding indicates that Indonesia requires a comprehensive AI governance framework capable of balancing technological innovation with legal accountability and the principles of good governance. Across interviews with policymakers, legal experts, and public administrators,

there was broad consensus that future AI regulation should move beyond fragmented sectoral policies toward an integrated legal framework specifically addressing AI deployment within public administration. Participants emphasized that regulatory reform should establish clear legal definitions, determine institutional responsibilities, specify administrative procedures for AI-assisted decision-making, and ensure compliance with constitutional principles and administrative law. The findings further suggest that AI governance should be grounded in fundamental legal principles, including legal certainty, transparency, proportionality, fairness, accountability, and the protection of fundamental rights throughout every stage of AI implementation.

Another important finding concerns the necessity of maintaining meaningful human oversight over AI-assisted administrative processes. Respondents consistently argued that AI should function as a decision-support instrument rather than an autonomous decision-maker. Administrative officials remain legally responsible for evaluating algorithmic recommendations before issuing legally binding decisions affecting citizens. Consequently, the proposed governance framework incorporates mandatory human review, explainable AI mechanisms, algorithmic auditing, and periodic risk assessments as essential safeguards for protecting procedural fairness. Furthermore, participants highlighted the importance of establishing clear complaint mechanisms through which citizens may challenge AI-assisted administrative decisions and obtain transparent explanations regarding the reasoning underlying governmental actions. These institutional safeguards are considered indispensable for preserving administrative accountability and preventing excessive reliance on automated systems.

The findings additionally demonstrate that effective AI governance requires strong institutional coordination among legislators, executive agencies, technology developers, independent oversight bodies, and civil society organizations. Participants recommended establishing standardized governance procedures covering AI procurement, algorithm validation, cybersecurity, data governance, ethical compliance, and continuous monitoring of AI performance within public institutions. The proposed framework also emphasizes independent regulatory supervision, regular compliance audits, public participation in regulatory development, and capacity-building programs for civil servants responsible for managing AI technologies. Collectively, these governance mechanisms are expected to improve legal certainty, strengthen institutional accountability, and reinforce citizens' trust in digital public services. Ultimately, the findings suggest that a principle-based AI regulatory framework represents a strategic legal foundation for ensuring that technological innovation contributes to transparent, accountable, and citizen-centered public governance in Indonesia.

Discussion

The findings of this study reinforce the growing body of literature arguing that the rapid adoption of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in public administration has significantly outpaced the development of legal and institutional frameworks governing its use (Mark & Morison, 2025; Walter, 2024). Previous studies have

consistently emphasized that AI offers substantial benefits in improving administrative efficiency, reducing bureaucratic delays, and supporting evidence-based decision-making (Bessaid, 2025). However, they also identify legal concerns related to transparency, privacy, algorithmic bias, and accountability. The present findings are consistent with these observations, demonstrating that Indonesian public institutions have increasingly integrated AI into administrative processes without a comprehensive legal framework specifically regulating its implementation (Bunkov et al., 2025; Lepri et al., 2017). Nevertheless, this study extends previous research by demonstrating that regulatory fragmentation not only creates legal uncertainty but also complicates the allocation of legal responsibility among public officials, government institutions, and technology providers (Decker et al., 2024; Langer, 2024). Accordingly, AI governance should be understood not merely as a technological issue but as a fundamental challenge of public law requiring comprehensive regulatory reform grounded in constitutional principles and administrative accountability.

Another important finding concerns the necessity of establishing meaningful legal accountability mechanisms for AI-assisted administrative decision-making (Iorio, 2026; Suksi, 2020). Existing scholarship has generally advocated transparency, explainability, and human oversight as essential principles of trustworthy AI governance. The empirical findings of this study strongly support these recommendations while providing additional evidence that current administrative procedures remain largely designed for human decision-makers rather than algorithm-assisted governance (Cobbe, 2019; Cojocaru, 2025). Consequently, the absence of explicit legal provisions regulating responsibility for AI-generated decisions may weaken procedural fairness and reduce opportunities for citizens to challenge administrative outcomes effectively (Adepoju & Chinonyerem, 2025; Allahrakha, 2025). This finding differs from earlier studies that predominantly focused on ethical governance or technological design by demonstrating that accountability should be institutionalized through legally enforceable administrative procedures. Therefore, legal responsibility must remain vested in competent public authorities, even when AI systems substantially contribute to governmental decision-making, thereby preserving the principles of legality, due process, and administrative justice.

The findings also generate important theoretical and practical implications while contributing to the broader discourse on AI governance in public administration. From a theoretical perspective, this study advances the integration of administrative law, AI governance, and good governance into a unified analytical framework capable of explaining legal accountability within algorithm-assisted public decision-making (Enarsson et al., 2021; Wahab & Suhardi, 2026). Unlike previous studies that often examined these concepts independently, this research demonstrates their interdependence in ensuring responsible digital governance (Aloisi & De Stefano, 2023; Zaidan & Ibrahim, 2024). From a practical perspective, the proposed governance framework

provides policymakers with a legal foundation for developing comprehensive AI regulations emphasizing legal certainty, transparency, human oversight, algorithmic auditing, and institutional accountability. These recommendations are expected to support future legislative reforms and administrative policy development in Indonesia. Ultimately, this study contributes to the evolving literature by positioning AI regulation as an essential component of democratic governance that simultaneously promotes technological innovation, safeguards citizens' rights, and strengthens public trust in digital government (Finch & Butt, 2025; Rajendra & Thuraisingam, 2025).

The proposed AI governance framework also has significant implications for the future development of public administration in Indonesia. Previous studies have generally emphasized ethical guidelines and voluntary governance principles as appropriate responses to the risks associated with AI adoption. While these approaches provide valuable normative guidance, the findings of this study indicate that ethical principles alone are insufficient to address the legal complexities arising from AI-assisted administrative decision-making (Al-Dulaimi & Mohammed, 2025; Goldsmith & Yang, 2025). Instead, legally binding regulations are required to define institutional authority, allocate legal responsibility, establish mandatory human oversight, and ensure effective judicial and administrative remedies for citizens affected by automated decisions. This finding complements existing scholarship by demonstrating that legal enforceability is a critical prerequisite for responsible AI governance. Consequently, regulatory reform should integrate administrative law principles with technological governance to ensure that innovation does not compromise constitutional guarantees, procedural fairness, or the legitimacy of governmental decision-making processes.

Finally, this study contributes to the ongoing international discussion concerning the relationship between AI regulation, legal accountability, and good governance in the public sector (Ameen et al., 2026). While numerous jurisdictions have introduced comprehensive AI governance frameworks based on risk management and human-centered principles, Indonesia remains in the early stages of developing a coherent regulatory architecture capable of responding to emerging technological challenges. The findings suggest that Indonesia should adopt a principle-based legal framework that incorporates transparency, explainability, accountability, proportionality, data protection, public participation, and continuous regulatory oversight. Such an approach would not only strengthen legal certainty but also promote institutional resilience and public confidence in digital government. Therefore, the contribution of this research extends beyond the Indonesian context by offering a normative-empirical perspective on how developing countries can formulate AI governance models that balance technological advancement with democratic values, the rule of law, and sustainable public sector innovation.

CONCLUSION

This study concludes that the rapid integration of Artificial Intelligence

(AI) into Indonesian public services has outpaced the development of an adequate legal framework, creating significant challenges related to legal certainty, accountability, transparency, and the realization of good governance. The most important finding is that effective AI governance cannot rely solely on technological innovation or ethical guidelines but requires a comprehensive, legally binding regulatory framework that clearly defines institutional responsibilities, ensures meaningful human oversight, strengthens algorithmic transparency, and protects citizens' rights throughout administrative decision-making processes. The primary scholarly contribution of this research lies in its integration of normative legal analysis and empirical evidence to develop a unified framework connecting AI regulation, legal accountability, and good governance, thereby enriching the literature on digital governance and public administrative law, particularly in developing countries. Nevertheless, this study is limited to the Indonesian public sector and selected institutional contexts, which may restrict the broader generalizability of its findings. Future research should conduct comparative cross-country analyses, examine sector-specific AI governance models, and evaluate the effectiveness of emerging AI regulations through longitudinal empirical studies to generate more comprehensive evidence for adaptive and sustainable regulatory development.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors sincerely express their gratitude to all participants, government officials, legal experts, and public administrators who generously contributed their time, knowledge, and valuable insights throughout this research. Appreciation is also extended to colleagues and academic reviewers for their constructive feedback, which significantly improved the quality of this study. Finally, the authors acknowledge the institutional support that facilitated the completion of this research and the preparation of this manuscript.

REFERENCES

- Adepoju, A. S., & Chinonyerem, C. A. (2025). ALGORITHMIC GOVERNANCE IN THE UNITED STATES PUBLIC SECTOR: DESIGNING TRANSPARENT AI SYSTEMS FOR POLICY DECISION-MAKING. *International Journal of Financial Research and Management Science*. <https://doi.org/10.70382/tijfrms.v09i7.025>
- Ahmad, N. (2026). AI-ENABLED PUBLIC GOVERNANCE IN DEVELOPING STATES: SERVICE DELIVERY GAINS, ACCOUNTABILITY RISKS, AND A PRACTICAL RISK-BASED REGULATORY MODEL. *Lex Localis - Journal of Local Self-Government*. <https://doi.org/10.52152/wja5db40>
- Akbar, N., Rais, R., & Nugroho, H. F. (2025). Personal Data Protection in the Era of Artificial Intelligence: A Critical Review of Indonesia's Regulatory Readiness Based on OECD Principles. *Global Journal of Law, AI & Ethics*. <https://doi.org/10.65917/gjlae.v1.i1.15>
- Al-Dulaimi, A. O. M., & Mohammed, M. (2025). Legal responsibility for errors

- caused by artificial intelligence (AI) in the public sector. *International Journal of Law and Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijlma-08-2024-0295>
- Allahrakha, N. (2025). AI and Corruption: Legal Liability in Algorithmic Decision-Making. *Access to Justice in Eastern Europe*. <https://doi.org/10.33327/ajee-18-8.3-a000120>
- Aloisi, A., & De Stefano, V. (2023). Between risk mitigation and labour rights enforcement: Assessing the transatlantic race to govern AI-driven decision-making through a comparative lens. *European Labour Law Journal*, 14, 283–307. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20319525231167982>
- Ameen, K. S., Towfiq, T. A., Mousa, K., & Pooyanmehr, M. (2026). Judicial review of algorithmic administrative systems legality evidence and remedies in the smart city state. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence*, 9. <https://doi.org/10.3389/frai.2026.1802986>
- Bessaid, N. (2025). Algorithmic Decision-Making in Public Administration: The Role of Artificial Intelligence Applications in Shaping Modern Administrative Law. *Science, Education and Innovations in the Context of Modern Problems*. <https://doi.org/10.56334/sei/8.12.5>
- Bhat, J., Sundar, D., & Jayaram, Y. (2024). AI Governance in Public Sector Enterprise Systems: Ensuring Trust, Compliance, and Ethics. *International Journal of Emerging Trends in Computer Science and Information Technology*. <https://doi.org/10.63282/3050-9246.ijetcsit-v5i1p114>
- Bunkov, A., Repin, D., & Shchegolev, P. (2025). Legal issues of implementing AI technologies in public administration and governance: Russian and international experience. *Sociology and Law*. <https://doi.org/10.35854/2219-6242-2025-3-386-396>
- Busuioc, M. (2020). Accountable Artificial Intelligence: Holding Algorithms to Account. *Public Administration Review*, 81, 825–836. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13293>
- Cobbe, J. (2019). Administrative law and the machines of government: judicial review of automated public-sector decision-making. *Legal Studies*, 39, 636–655. <https://doi.org/10.1017/lst.2019.9>
- Cojocar, A. (2025). Governing AI with trust: an adaptive framework for institutional legitimacy in the UK public sector. *Transforming Government: People, Process and Policy*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/tg-05-2025-0125>
- Conduah, A., Ofoe, S., & Siaw-Marfo, D. (2025). Data privacy in healthcare: Global challenges and solutions. *Digital Health*, 11. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20552076251343959>
- Decker, M., Wegner, L., & Leicht-Scholten, C. (2024). Procedural fairness in algorithmic decision-making: the role of public engagement. *Ethics and Information Technology*, 27. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10676-024-09811-4>
- Ehimuan, B., Chimezie, O., Ob, Akagha, O., Reis, O., & Oguejiofor, B. B. (2024). Global data privacy laws: A critical review of technology's impact on user rights. *World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews*.

- <https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2024.21.2.0369>
- Enarsson, T., Enqvist, L., & Naarttijärvi, M. (2021). Approaching the human in the loop – legal perspectives on hybrid human/algorithmic decision-making in three contexts. *Information & Communications Technology Law*, 31, 123–153. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13600834.2021.1958860>
- Finch, W., & Butt, M. (2025). Gaps in AI-Compliant Complementary Governance Frameworks’ Suitability (for Low-Capacity Actors), and Structural Asymmetries (in the Compliance Ecosystem) - A Systematic Review. *J. Cybersecur. Priv.*, 5, 101. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jcp5040101>
- Goldsmith, S., & Yang, J. (2025). AI and the Transformation of Accountability and Discretion in Urban Governance. *ArXiv*, abs/2502.13101. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ugj.2026.02.005>
- Hadiaty, S., & Saefullah, R. (2026). Assessing the Adequacy of Indonesia’s Personal Data Protection Law (UU PDP No. 27/2022) Against Emerging AI-Generated Identity Fraud: A Comparative Legal Analysis. *International Journal of Humanities, Law, and Politics*. <https://doi.org/10.46336/ijhlp.v4i2.338>
- Iorio, L. (2026). Transparency Warranties for Algorithmic Decisions in Administrative Procedures. Synopsis between EU Law and the Italian Legal System. *Athens Journal of Law*. <https://doi.org/10.30958/ajl.12-2-3>
- Kaur, M., Sharma, N., Mehta, P. K., Dhanoa, M. K., & Anegebe, B. (2026). Data Protection Laws and Privacy Rights in the Digital Age: Legal Challenges and Emerging Frameworks. *Indian Journal of Law*. <https://doi.org/10.36676/ijl.v4.i1.162>
- Langer, C. (2024). Decision-making power and responsibility in an automated administration. *Discover Artificial Intelligence*, 4. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44163-024-00152-1>
- Lepri, B., Oliver, N., Letouzé, E., Pentland, A., & Vinck, P. (2017). Fair, Transparent, and Accountable Algorithmic Decision-making Processes. *Philosophy & Technology*, 31, 611–627. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-017-0279-x>
- Li, C. (2025). AI-Driven Governance: Enhancing Transparency and Accountability in Public Administration. *Digital Society & Virtual Governance*. <https://doi.org/10.6914/dsvg.010101>
- Mark, D., & Morison, J. (2025). Governing AI Decision-Making: Balancing Innovation and Accountability. *Politics and Governance*. <https://doi.org/10.17645/pag.10245>
- Misic, J., Est, R., & Kool, L. (2025). Good governance of public sector AI: a combined value framework for good order and a good society. *AI and Ethics*, 5, 4875–4889. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-025-00751-3>
- MohammadAmini, M., Jesus, M., Sheikholeslami, D. F., Alves, P., Benam, A. H., & Hariri, F. (2023). Artificial Intelligence Ethics and Challenges in Healthcare Applications: A Comprehensive Review in the Context of the European GDPR Mandate. *Mach. Learn. Knowl. Extr.*, 5, 1023–1035.

- <https://doi.org/10.3390/make5030053>
- Radanliev, P. (2025). Privacy, ethics, transparency, and accountability in AI systems for wearable devices. *Frontiers in Digital Health*, 7. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fdgth.2025.1431246>
- Rajendra, J. B., & Thuraisingam, A. (2025). The role of explainability and human intervention in AI decisions: jurisdictional and regulatory aspects. *Information & Communications Technology Law*, 35, 152–183. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13600834.2025.2537514>
- Suksi, M. (2020). Administrative due process when using automated decision-making in public administration: some notes from a Finnish perspective. *Artificial Intelligence and Law*, 29, 87–110. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10506-020-09269-x>
- Wahab, A., & Suhardi, M. (2026). ALGORITHMIC TRANSPARENCY IN DIGITAL PUBLIC SERVICES: AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW PERSPECTIVE. *Jurnal Kecerdasan Buatan Dan Teknologi Informasi*. <https://doi.org/10.69916/jkbt.v5i1.461>
- Walter, Y. (2024). Managing the race to the moon: Global policy and governance in Artificial Intelligence regulation—A contemporary overview and an analysis of socioeconomic consequences. *Discover Artificial Intelligence*, 4(1), 14.
- Weiner, E., Dankwa-Mullan, I., Nelson, W., & Hassanpour, S. (2024). Ethical challenges and evolving strategies in the integration of artificial intelligence into clinical practice. *PLOS Digital Health*, 4. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pdig.0000810>
- Yalid. (2025). The Concept Of Legal Norms Of Personal Data Protection Related To Data Processing In The Form Of Artificial Intelligence. *Jurnal Riset Multidisiplin Edukasi*. <https://doi.org/10.71282/jurmie.v2i1.75>
- Ye, X., Yan, Y., Li, J., & Jiang, B. (2024). Privacy and personal data risk governance for generative artificial intelligence: A Chinese perspective. *Telecommunications Policy*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.telpol.2024.102851>
- Yoon, H., Belkhouja, M., & Dau, L. (2025). Privacy protection laws, national culture, and artificial intelligence innovation around the world. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 56, 853–873. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41267-025-00790-2>
- Zahra, Y. (2025). Ensuring Data Privacy in the Age of Artificial Intelligence. *Journal of Computer Science Application and Engineering (JOSAPEN)*. <https://doi.org/10.70356/josapen.v3i2.66>
- Zaidan, E., & Ibrahim, I. (2024). AI Governance in a Complex and Rapidly Changing Regulatory Landscape: A Global Perspective. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 11. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-03560-x>
- Zisu, M.-A. (2025). Personal Data Protection in the Era of Artificial Intelligence: Legal Challenges and Solutions. *Anuarul Universitatii Petre Andrei Din Iasi -*

Fascicula: Drept, Stiinte Economice, Stiinte Politice.
<https://doi.org/10.63331/upalaw/34/23>