The Sankalpa: International Journal of Management Decisions
ISSN: 2454-7425
Volume 12, Issue 1 (January – June 2026)

The Regulatory Landscape of AI Governance An Analytical Examination

Randa Henouz [1]
Mohamed Lamine Debaghine University, Algeria
E-mail: r.henouz@univ-setif2.dz
Asma Guerchouche [2]
Mohamed Lamine Debaghine University, Algeria
E-mail: a.guerchouche@univ-setif2.dz

Received: 15/11/2025 Accepted:20/04/2026 Published: 03/06/2026

Abstract
This paper provides a comprehensive analysis of the evolving regulatory landscape surrounding Artificial Intelligence (AI) governance. It delves into the multifaceted characteristics of regulatory frameworks, the efficacy of various governance models, and the potential for international collaboration in harmonizing AI regulations. It also emphasizes that incorporating ethical standards, regulatory accountability, active stakeholder involvement, and flexibility in response to technology advancements are critical to successful AI governance**.** for that the study addresses fundamental inquiries such as the definition of AI governance, prevailing frameworks across diverse jurisdictions, methods for evaluating governance model effectiveness, and pathways for global harmonization

1. Introduction

The swift progression of artificial intelligence (AI) technologies has heralded a novel epoch characterized by both innovation and intricacy, thereby presenting unparalleled opportunities alongside substantial challenges. As AI systems become more deeply embedded across diverse sectors, ranging from healthcare to finance, the imperative for robust governance frameworks has emerged as a paramount concern for policymakers globally. The dynamic regulatory landscape pertaining to AI governance epitomizes a variety of methodologies embraced by disparate

nations, each endeavoring to navigate the equilibrium between stimulating innovation and ensuring ethical adherence. This investigation aspires to enhance the comprehension of AI governance by delving into the multifaceted characteristics of regulatory frameworks, the efficacy of various governance models, and the possibilities for international collaboration in the harmonization of AI regulations.

At the core of AI governance is the necessity to delineate explicit standards that guarantee the responsible and equitable implementation of AI technologies. As generative artificial intelligence (GAI) persistently disrupts traditional information ecosystems, the establishment of precise regulatory mechanisms emerges as critical for safeguarding public interests and fostering trust in AI systems. This manuscript endeavors to address four fundamental inquiries: What precisely constitutes AI governance? What are the prevailing frameworks that regulate AI across diverse jurisdictions? How can the efficacy of these governance models be evaluated in addressing challenges associated with AI? Lastly, what pathways exist for promoting global collaboration and the harmonization of AI regulations?

By scrutinizing these inquiries, this study will furnish a thorough analysis of the current landscape of AI governance, underscoring the essential role of interdisciplinary collaboration in the development of effective regulatory frameworks.As the discourse surrounding AI governance broadens, it becomes increasingly crucial to contemplate the ramifications of disparate regulatory approaches and the imperative for cohesive international agreements that prioritize ethical standards and societal well-being. Ultimately, this manuscript aims to establish a foundational understanding of the intricacies of AI governance and its consequences for the future trajectory of technology and society.

2- What is AI governance ?

The ongoing transition toward artificial general intelligence (AGI) represents a highly transformative era. In this phase, autonomous systems increasingly mirror human cognition and decision-making, which progressively blurs the boundary separating algorithmic processes from human judgment. Within this context, AI governance operates as an emerging discipline. It focuses on how corporations can optimize traditional corporate governance, introducing novel practices to capitalize on AI benefits while minimizing potential harms to businesses, individuals, and broader society. To ensure that AI technologies remain accurate, fair, accountable, and aligned with their specific objectives, governance

necessitates a combination of organization-wide frameworks, project-level checkpoints, and system-specific interventions. (Human Technology Institution. 2024.p1)

The political and ethical dimensions of AI provide a critical consideration that highlights the social contexts under which AI technologies are designed and implemented. The critical analysis reveals that the settings that shape AI are not inclusive and diverse, and this can lead to systems that do not cater to the multifaceted needs of various stakeholders (Kinnula et al., 2021). Furthermore, as AI technologies permeate every corner, there is a pressing need for trust and trustworthiness in AI systems. This is crucial for user adoption, particularly in sensitive areas like healthcare, where clinicians' adoptionof AI-decided decision support systems relies on their belief in the reliability of the system instead of a belief about the AI as an epistemic authority (Asan et al., 2020 ; Dlugatch et al., 2024).

The overall public image of AI and what it can perform is shallow with the bulk being subject to sensationalized presentation on the mass media, which will influence opinions about AI functionalities in the real world (Nader et al., 2022). The trust issues are also worsened by vague labeling practices on online material, where individuals suspect AI outputs even when they are accurate (Altay & Gilardi, 2024). This scepticism underlines the need for better communication of the roles and limits of AI, as well as education intervention for enhanced AI literacy in various sectors in society, including K- (Touretzky et al., 2019; Otero et al., 2023).

interdisciplinary research is necessary for the completeunderstanding of AI, where interdisciplinarity involves cross-disciplinaryintegration to forge effective definitions and frameworks facilitatingdiversified applications of AI technologies (Newman-Griffis, 2025). Experts point out the necessity to formulate ethical guidelines and regulations that not only lay emphasis on technological possibility but also societal effects of AI deployment in such a way that these technologies serve the common interest of humanity and do not extend existing divides (Reinhardt, 2022).

AI governance is ultimately achieved by people working together to ensure that all AI systems operate effectively, responsibly and legally in the way that the organization intends. Effective governance therefore requires an organization to have the right people with relevant skills, aligned values and a supportive culture across the AI system lifecycle, from design to decommissioning. While many organizations have prioritized the acquisition of technical skills for AI, this

component suggests that possessing strategic skills related to AI systems and building an appropriately diverse AI culture are equally important.

This component of AI governance is one of then most wide-ranging and complex, encompassing both competencies and values. Thanks to the proliferation of third-party AI services and the extended 'value chain' of AI system, issues related to people, skills, values and culture affect employees at all organizational levels and will often extend to contractors, suppliers and technology partners. This area also has special relevance for the composition, skills and culture of company directors. (Human Technology Institution. 2024.p2)

3-Global Approaches and Core Tensions for AI regulations:

The AI Act is an unprecedented shift in regulatory thinking with an emphasis on constructive cooperation between actors, such as governments and the private sector. By applying ethical norms, engagement practices, and regulation, the EU strives to balance the creation of AI technologies with the protection of essential rights and public interests (Karami, 2024; Parisini & Dervishaj, 2025). Evidence suggests that how effective such rules are depends not just on their enactment but also on the enactment and willingness to comply of stakeholders (Labuz, 2024). National competent authorities, since the subject has been investigated in many studies, are key to accurate monitoring and enforcement of these rules (Parisini & Dervishaj, 2025).

In non-EU countries, other nations are creating their own AI governance models. For instance, laws like the California Consumer Privacy Act (CCPA) in the US demonstrate growing understanding of the requirement for data protection and transparency within AI systems (Onoja et al., 2021) The merging of universals from existing laws like the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) with evolving local norms signifies an international movement towards harmonious regulation of AI (Onoja et al., 2021). Countries are increasingly willing to shape their regulatory approaches to foster innovation while being legally and morally responsible.

Additionally, studies reveal that effective AI governance relies on multilayered frameworks encompassing regulation, certification, and standards to promote public trust (Agarwal & Nene, 2025,Ganesh, 2025). Among the proposed models is made up of five layers that merge regulatory requirements with actionable guidelines for implementation, thereby providing a systematic approach for addressing key areas of fairness, accountability, and transparency in the operations of AI (Agarwal & Nene, 2025). All the layers address distinct governance

challenges, thereby making organizations adequately equipped to assure regulatory compliance as well as establishing an ethical culture of using AI (Ganesh, 2025)

To be actionable, ethical concepts like justice must be converted into procedures and assignments. A number of governance frameworks have been established to direct the development and application of AI, despite the fact that most AI standards are non-binding. Among the most well-known frameworks are:

- The IEEE Global Initiative on Intelligent and Autonomous Systems Ethics
- The EU AI Act is based on the EU's Ethics Guidelines for Trustworthy AI.
- The Responsible AI Declaration of Montreal
- The NIST Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework and the AIGA AI Governance Framework. (Malter.2025)

In the financial sector, AI governance frameworks become particularly relevant as they encounter unique compliance challenges in regard to risk management as well as customer data protection (Thoom, 2025). Specific governance strategies have been proposed to enhance compliance procedures and mitigate risks of AI implementation among financial institutions (Thoom, 2025). However, the rapidly evolving nature of technology necessitates that these frameworks become extremely dynamic so as to react immediately to arising risks and ethical issues (Ganesh, 2025)

Besides regulatory markets, a unified legal framework must be developed in order for effective AI regulation to take place because it stipulates the rights and duties of the concerned subjects, which range from a developer to the end-users. Also, such a legal framework would need to not only confront challenges of accountability and transparency but public participation as well, to allow citizens to voice their concerns and expectations of AI technologies. For instance, including the views of the people through the regulation process can help in establishing trust and acceptability that are imperative for the efficient usage of AI systems in society (Tasriqul, Sadia, and Zand 2024).

The governance of artificial intelligence (AI) across jurisdictions is characterized by a mix of high-level principles, sector- and risk-sensitive regulations, and instrumented approaches such as regulatory sandboxes, with notable convergence around trustworthiness, human rights protection, and evidence-informed policy design. Across the OECD, EU, China, Latin America, and other regions, these frameworks typically blend soft-law ethics guidelines, formal legislative or

regulatory regimes, and experimental/regulatory sandbox instruments to reconcile innovation with public interest and fundamental rights. The body of literature and policy reports cited below collectively supports a synthesized view of the current frameworks and their characteristic instruments, governance actors, and regulatory philosophies. Lastly, ongoing growth of AI governance frameworks across various levels of jurisdictions turns out to be a concerted worldwide effort to advance sustainable, responsible, and accountable AI systems.

3-1- Ethics Guidelines and Principles as Global Governance Anchors:

- Ethics guidelines and principles as global governance anchors:
- International bodies like the OECD and the EU have grounded their AI governance frameworks in foundational ethical principles. These emphasize trustworthiness, data privacy, accountability, non-discrimination, transparency, and human-centric systems. In execution, these guidelines serve as blueprints for national strategies, risk evaluation standards, and legislative blueprints. They frequently pave the way for binding statutes when jurisdictions determine that public safety and trust require enforceable mandates. (Larsson,2020)
- The European Union's Ethics Guidelines for Trustworthy AI and its foundational White Paper showcase how ethical directives act as central policy instruments, steering AI development across public and private sectors while shaping future regulatory directions. (Truby et al, 2021 p13)
- Formal regulatory regimes and policy frameworks
- National strategies and statutory architectures are becoming increasingly codified into law, as seen with the EU AI Act and its accompanying oversight bodies. Current literature illustrates how governments translate abstract ethical values into concrete statutory obligations, implementing sector-specific rules, assigning supervisory authorities, and mandating strict compliance duties.
- Furthermore, comparative policy typologies reveal how distinct political structures dictate AI policy formulation, institutional design, and key actors, proving that governance approaches are non-monolithic and depend heavily on national political environments and regulatory cultures. (Filgueiras ,2023,p4)

3-2- Policy design and evidence-informed governance

- Governance approaches increasingly emphasize evidence-informed policymaking and the use of formal decision-support tools (e.g., Multi-Criteria Analyses, Sensitivity Analyses) to navigate uncertainty and reconcile regulation with innovation. This strand advocates for harmonization and careful policy design spaces that acknowledge the definitional ambiguity of AI and the dynamic risk landscape. Comparative studies show that policy design dynamics are shaped by regime type, institutions, and strategic priorities, informing how jurisdictions implement and revise AI policies . (Filgueiras ,2023,p6)

3-3- Jurisdictional highlights and governance trajectories

- **OECD and Global Landscapes:** OECD documentation (such as *The State of Implementation of the OECD AI Principles*) provides a panoramic perspective on how national policies integrate evaluation systems, oversight bodies, ethics frameworks, and tracking models. Many countries are establishing dedicated expert advisory panels, regulatory agencies, and sandbox environments to meet trustworthiness goals aligned with the OECD AI Principles. This reflects a global trend marked by a proliferation of national ethics guidelines and AI-specific legislation.. (Cao, 2024).
- **The European Union:** The EU is widely recognized as a pioneering force in AI governance, utilizing a dual method that couples ethics-centric guidelines with a strict, risk-based regulatory framework. This approach incorporates regulatory sandboxes to test high-risk AI models under strict safety protocols. Academic and policy literature highlights the EU's use of sandboxes alongside formal law to construct an environment of trust that fosters innovation while protecting human rights. In the European context, these sandboxes offer a valuable opportunity framework for small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), allowing for regulatory learning before full compliance mandates take effect. The EU AI Act marks a major shift toward constructive, bilateral cooperation between private enterprises and government bodies. By integrating ethical criteria, collaborative practices, and strict rules, the EU seeks to nurture AI advancement while safeguarding fundamental civil rights and public welfare. However, the efficacy of these statutes rests not only on their enactment, but also on the baseline willingness of stakeholders to comply. Competent national

authorities are pivotal in ensuring precise monitoring and enforcement.(Poščić, and Martinović,2023)

- **China and East Asia:** Literature evaluating China's AI governance underscores a dual mission: accelerating AI-centric technological innovation while enforcing strict safety oversight. This approach calls for comprehensive supervisory systems alongside innovative tools, including regulatory sandboxes, cross-departmental state cooperation, and heightened self-discipline norms within the tech industry. These core themes highlight a governance model that blends state-mandated benchmarks with flexible, controlled experimentation. (Huanget al,2024,p6)
- **Latin America and Developing Regions:** Policy frameworks within Latin America illustrate how specific political structures shape national AI policy spaces. These analyses shed light on the unique design landscapes, governance modes, and operational contexts that influence how a region balances technological innovation with ethical standards and public interests. In developing economies, comprehensive AI policy models are recommended to encourage responsible technological growth while safeguarding individual liberties. This global outlook highlights how core governance concepts can be customized to fit diverse socio-economic realities without abandoning essential ethical principles.
- Public administration and global governance framing
    - AI governance is framed around the role of governments as coordinators of technological transition and regulators of AI-enabled public services. This includes integrating AI into policy processes and ensuring alignment with rights and sustainability goals, signaling a broad public governance remit beyond the technology sector . (Filgueiras ,2023)

3-4- Synthesis: a cohesive view of current frameworks governing AI

- A multi-layered governance architecture is emerging globally, combining (a) aspirational ethics guidelines that set trustworthiness and rights-based benchmarks; (b) binding or quasi-binding regulation and sector-specific rules that operationalize those benchmarks; and (c) experimental and learning-oriented instruments designed to accelerate innovation while mitigating risk and enabling policy learning .The governance landscape is characterized by a strong emphasis on trust, transparency, accountability,

risk management, and human-centric design, with a progressive shift from soft-law guidelines toward more formal regulatory regimes in many jurisdictions (e.g., EU AI Act, national AI laws) . (Huanget al, 2024, p9).

Sandboxes appear as a central instrument to bridge innovation and regulation, providing controlled environments where developers, regulators, and users can observe impacts and iterate policy designs. This approach is advocated across both EU and non-EU literature as a practical path to safe experimentation and regulatory learning . (Koker et al,2020)

Policy design and harmonization remain ongoing challenges due to definitional ambiguity of AI, diverse regulatory cultures, and rapidly evolving technologies. The literature recommends evidence-informed policy making, cross-jurisdictional learning, and modular, proportionate regulatory approaches to balance innovation with societal protection. (Maydell, 2025)

4- The effectiveness of governance models in mitigating AI-related risks:

The governance of artificial intelligence (AI) presents unique challenges that necessitate a multifaceted approach, as the complexity of AI systems and their societal implications require thoughtful regulatory frameworks. Assessing the effectiveness of various AI governance models reveals a critical need for frameworks that can address ethical concerns, promote accountability, ensure transparency, and foster innovation.

Governance models aimed at addressing AI-related challenges often emphasize the roles of key actors and authorities involved in rule formulation. Gahnberg notes that recognizing who the 'governors' of AI are can help in understanding the dynamics of rule-making in this space, providing a basis for developing frameworks that accommodate diverse stakeholder interests (Gahnberg, 2021). This is echoed by Giordani and Zeko, who stress that effective governance frameworks are essential in responding to the ethica1 and risk management challenges posed by AI and machine learning (ML) systems By creating inclusive and representative governance structures, it becomes feasible to mitigate risks such as data bias and ethical violations, which plague AI implementations across various sectors .

In the health sector, for instance, the complexities surrounding medical AI systems necessitate tailored governance mechanisms. As Zhang and Zhang argue, regulatory agencies need to implement policies specifically designed for the continual evaluation of medical AI technologies (Zhang & Zhang, 2023). This

notion of tailored governance is vital across different industries to address the distinct ethical implications and operational challenges that AI presents.

Furthermore, Batool et al. emphasize the importance of developing robust governance solutions that transcend mere technical concerns, arguing that a systematic approach that aligns with ethical usage is imperative for avoiding unforeseen negative impacts caused by AI This is reinforced by Cath's exploration of ethical and technical challenges in establishing accountability and fairness in AI, suggesting that a comprehensive governance framework can serve as both a regulatory guide and a foundation for innovation (Cath, 2018).

Effective governance models also prioritize educating stakeholders about AI, as seen in the framework proposed by Robles and Mallinson. They identify the need for consistent policies that engender public trust and address privacy concerns while harnessing AI's potential for societal benefit (Robles & Mallinson, 2023).

In developing countries, frameworks such as that proposed by Folorunso et al. suggest the implementation of comprehensive AI policy frameworks that promote responsible development while safeguarding individual rights (Folorunso et al., 2024). This global perspective highlights how governance models can be adapted to different socio-economic contexts while maintaining ethical considerations.

In summary, effective AI governance models must integrate ethical standards, regulatory accountability, stakeholder engagement, and adaptability to evolve alongside technological advancements. By leveraging successful practices from diverse regions, such frameworks can not only address current AI-related challenges but also establish a foundation for future innovation.

Artificial intelligence is now embedded in critical domains such as healthcare, finance, public administration, and cloud infrastructure, creating significant technical, ethical, and societal risks. Governance models—ranging from regulation to internal enterprise frameworks—aim to reduce these risks while preserving innovation. Research increasingly evaluates how these models work in practice and where they fall short.

4-1Conceptual Governance Models and Risk Coverage

Risk-based, multi-layer frameworks

Several papers propose multi-layer or lifecycle-based models that map AI risks (technical, ethical, social, legal) to specific governance actions, arguing that effectiveness depends on aligning controls with risk categories and AI lifecycle

phases (Szádeczky et al,2025). Public-sector frameworks emphasize risk-oriented, multi-stakeholder governance to address technological, ethical, and legal risks . (Wirtz, et al. 2020).

Risk classification and tailoring

Regulatory analyses stress categorizing applications from minimal to high risk, with stricter oversight, transparency, and compliance obligations for high-risk AI to reduce adverse outcomes in safety-critical contexts . (Szádeczky,2025).

4-2-Empirical Evidence of Effectiveness -Enterprise and sectoral studies-:

In energy sector firms, structured AI governance practices were associated with robust applications and avoidance of negative effects, including improved confidence in results and competitive advantage, though generalizability is limited. (Papagiannidis,2022).

In CI/CD-enabled enterprises, higher AI governance maturity and integrated risk intelligence significantly predicted better reliability, fewer incidents, and stronger competitive positioning .

Across enterprises, comprehensive AI governance correlated with significantly fewer security incidents and better regulatory compliance than conventional governance alone. (Chikoti, 2025).

4-3-Sector-Specific Governance and High-Risk Contexts

Healthcare studies highlight that hospital-level, adaptive governance is crucial for mitigating patient safety, accountability, and trust risks and for successful adoption of predictive and generative AI.High-risk systems in healthcare and credit scoring require clear accountability, ethical oversight, and algorithmic accountability structures to prevent discrimination and harmful outcomes . (Szádeczky,2025)

Cloud and data-intensive environments benefit from governance emphasizing PETs, ethical oversight, and incident response; quantitative models show incident response metrics and ethical oversight as critical drivers of security and compliance (Salako, 2024)

5-opportunities exist for global collaboration and the harmonization of AI regulations :

Many frameworks are conceptual or based on literature reviews and have not yet been longitudinally validated in real organizations . (Chikoti, 2025).

Case studies often cover limited sectors, time frames, and non-sensitive data, constraining generalizability . (Papagiannidis,2022).Global governance remains fragmented, with regulatory inertia and cross-border coordination problems limiting effectiveness at the international level .

As the need for strong AI governance becomes ever more apparent, the role of interdisciplinary cooperation materializes as a key determinant of successful regulatory frameworks. By synthesizing knowledge from disciplines ranging from ethics and law to technology, policymakers are able to formulate holistic approaches that respond not just to the technical difficulties presented by AI, but also to the ethical questions relating to its use. For example, the development of a technology assurance regulatory framework, such as in recent proposals, would provide a blueprint for ensuring that AI systems are engineered with safety and accountability considerations in mind, and in doing so, build public trust and societal acceptance. (ellul et al,2021)

Furthermore, the continuous development of AI technologies necessitates adaptive regulatory responses that are capable of attending to novel risks, especially those causing harm to underrepresented groups, underscoring the pressing requirement for inclusive governance that foregrounds equity and justice in AI uses. This inclusive governance strategy not only responds to AI's asymmetrical impact but also stresses the significance of stakeholder participation and cooperation in informing ethical structures for AI use.It is this cooperative strategy that is instrumental in crafting governance frameworks that are not merely efficacious but also fair, where the potentialgains of AI are realized by every stratum of society. (Dixon,2022)

The integration of interdisciplinary perspectives is vital for crafting governance structures that effectively address the multifaceted challenges presented by AI technologies. As the dialogue surrounding AI governance continues to expand, it is crucial to consider the implications of varying regulatory approaches adopted across different jurisdictions. For instance, the European Union's comprehensive framework, which emphasizes transparency and accountability, contrasts sharply with the more fragmented and gradual regulatory landscape in the United States, where innovation often takes precedence over stringent oversight . (Cardozo ,2023).

This divergence highlights the potential challenges in harmonizing global standards, as countries grapple with balancing innovation against ethical responsibilities. Furthermore, as AI systems increasingly intersect with societal

issues such as privacy and discrimination, the urgency for cohesive international regulatory agreements becomes paramount. Such treaties could not only facilitate cooperation among nations but also establish a foundation for shared ethical practices in AI deployment, ultimately fostering a more responsible and equitable technological future.This need for cohesive international regulatory agreements underscores the importance of collaborative frameworks that prioritize ethical AI governance while accommodating diverse cultural and legal contexts. (Pasupuleti, ,2024).

6- Conclusion

In summary, successful AI governance relies on integrating ethical principles, regulatory accountability, active stakeholder engagement, and the agility to adapt alongside technological breakthroughs. A broad consensus of scholars emphasizes the need for interdisciplinary regulatory strategies, calling for inclusive dialogues that bridge the technical and ethical dimensions of AI development. Navigating this regulatory landscape demands a multi-pronged approach that addresses public concerns, enforces institutional accountability, and promotes international partnerships.

Given the fluid nature of the global environment, a harmonized approach to AI regulation is vital. Disconnected national frameworks risk creating market fragmentation that can stall international collaboration. Current initiatives to maximize accountability include crafting granular ethical directives and specialized compliance metrics specifically tailored to handle pressing challenges like personal privacy and data protection.

Across regions, AI governance is moving from principles to enforceable, often risk-based regulation that combines horizontal acts with sector-specific rules. Core tools—transparency, accountability, and human oversight—are now widespread, yet enforcement capacity, bias control, and treatment of adaptive systems remain problematic. Divergent models in the EU, US, China, and others create complexity but also drive experimentation. Many scholars and policymakers converge on the need for adaptive, multi-layered frameworks and stronger international coordination to ensure AI systems are safe, rights-respecting, and supportive of sustainable innovation.

References :

- Agarwal, A. K. and Nene, M. J. (2025). A five-layer framework for ai governance: integrating regulation, standards, and certification. Transforming Government: People, Process and Policy. https://doi.org/10.1108/tg-03-2025-0065
- Altay, S. and Gilardi, F. (2024). People are skeptical of headlines labeled as ai-generated, even if true or human-made, because they assume full ai automation. PNAS Nexus, 3(10). https://doi.org/10.1093/pnasnexus/pgae403
- Asan, O., Bayrak, A. E., & Choudhury, A. (2020). Artificial intelligence and human trust in healthcare: focus on clinicians. Journal of Medical Internet Research, 22(6), e15154. https://doi.org/10.2196/15154
- Cath, C., et al. (2018) Governing Artificial Intelligence: Ethical, Legal and Technical Challenges and Opportunities. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences, 376, https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2018.0080
- Cardozo, G. T. (2023). *Approach to global regulations around AI*. https://doi.org/10.62486/latia20237
- Dixon, R. B. L. (2022). A principled governance for emerging AI regimes: lessons from China, the European Union, and the United States. *AI and Ethics*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-022-00205-0
- Ellul, J., Pace, G. J., McCarthy, S., Sammut, T., Brockdorff, J., & Scerri, M. (2021). Regulating artificial intelligence: a technology regulator's perspective. *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Law*. https://doi.org/10.1145/3462757.3466093
- Filgueiras, Héctor. (2022).Artificial Intelligence Policy Regimes: Comparing Politics and Policy to National Strategies for Artificial Intelligence. Global Perspectives 15, no. 2 ,1–20. https://doi:10.1525/gp.2022.32362.
- Filgueiras, Héctor. (2025) , Designing Artificial Intelligence Policy: Comparing Design Spaces in Latin America." Latin American Policy Ganesh, N. Corporate governance in the age of ai: ethical oversight and accountability frameworks. Journal of Information Systems

Engineering and Management, 10(35s), 1141-1148. https://doi.org/10.52783/jisem.v10i35s.6285

- Gahnberg, C. (2021). What rules? framing the governance of artificial agency. Policy and Society, 40(2), 194-210. https://doi.org/10.1080/14494035.2021.1929729
- Ganesh, N. (2025). Corporate governance in the age of ai: ethical oversight and accountability frameworks. Journal of Information Systems Engineering and Management, 10(35s), 1141-1148. https://doi.org/10.52783/jisem.v10i35s.6285
- Ho, Seng Lin, and Casper Caals. (2024), How the EU AI Act Seeks to Establish an Epistemic Environment of Trust. Asian Bioethics Review 14, no. 1 1–12. https://doi:10.1007/s41649-024-00304-6.
- Huang, Jie, et al. (2024) , The Legal Challenges and Regulatory Responses to Artificial Intelligence (AI) in China." In Artificial Intelligence and the Law: Proceedings of the International Conference on AI Regulation, 1–12. http://doi:10.2991/978-94-6463-352-8_26.
- Human technology institution. (2024) .essential components AI governance. Symposium 2024. https://www.uts.edu.au/globalassets/sites/default/files/2024-01/ai-governance-snapshot---essential-components-of-ai-governance.pdf
- Karami, A. (2024). Artificial intelligence governance in the european union. Journal of Electrical Systems, 20(11s), 2706-2720. https://doi.org/10.52783/jes.7938
- Kinnula, M., Iivari, N., Sharma, S., Eden, G., Turunen, M., Achuthan, K., … & Tulaskar, R. (2021). Researchers' toolbox for the future: understanding and designing accessible and inclusive artificial intelligence (aiai). Academic Mindtrek 2021, 1-4. https://doi.org/10.1145/3464327.3464965
- Koker, A. Yavuz, et al. (2020), "Regulating Financial Services in an Era of Technological Disruption." Law and Context 36, no. 2 , 98–120. doi:10.26826/law-in-context.v36i2.98.
- Łabuz, M. (2024). Deep fakes and the artificial intelligence act—an important signal or a missed opportunity?. Policy &Amp; Internet, 16(4), 783-800. https://doi.org/10.1002/poi3.406

- Larsson, Sven. (2020). On the Governance of Artificial Intelligence Through Ethics Guidelines. Asian Journal of Law and Society 7, no. 3 doi:10.1017/als.2020.19
- Malter,N. (2024). Implementing AI Governance: from Framework to Practice. European AI Alliance. https://futurium.ec.europa.eu/en/european-ai-alliance/best-practices/implementing-ai-governance-framework-practice
- Maydell, Jurgen. (2025). European Governance of Artificial Intelligence: Bridging Uncertainty With Evidence-Informed Policy Making." Contemporary European Politics. doi:10.1002/cep4.70016.
- Nader, K., Toprac, P., Scott, S., & Baker, S. (2022). Public understanding of artificial intelligence through entertainment media. AI &Amp; SOCIETY, 39(2), 713-726. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-022-01427-w
- Newman-Griffis, D. (2025). Ai thinking: a framework for rethinking artificial intelligence in practice. Royal Society Open Science, 12(1). https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.241482
- Onoja, J. P., Hamza, O., Collins, A., Chibunna, U. B., Eweja, A., & Daraojimba, A. I. (2021). Digital transformation and data governance: strategies for regulatory compliance and secure ai-driven business operations. Journal of Frontiers in Multidisciplinary Research, 2(1), 43-55. https://doi.org/10.54660/.ijfmr.2021.2.1.43-55
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. The State of Implementation of the OECD AI Principles Four Years On. 2023. https://doi.org/10.1787/835641c9-en.
- Otero, L. C., Catalá, A., Fernández-Morante, C., Taboada, M., López, B. C., & Barro, S. (2023). Ai literacy in k-12: a systematic literature review. International Journal of STEM Education, 10(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40594-023-00418-7
- Parisini, E. and Dervishaj, E. (2025). Emerging models of national competent authorities under the eu ai act. Conference on Digital Government Research, 1. https://doi.org/10.59490/dgo.2025.1007
- Pasupuleti, M. K. (2024). *Ethical AI Governance: A Global Blueprint*. https://doi.org/10.62311/nesx/97832

- Poščić, Dario, and Martinović, Nikola. (2023), Regulatory Sandboxes under the Draft EU Artificial Intelligence Act: An Opportunity for SMEs?" Intereulaweast Journal for the International and European Law Economics and Market Integrations 1–20. doi:10.22598/iele.2022.9.2.3.
- Reinhardt, K. (2022). Trust and trustworthiness in ai ethics. AI and Ethics, 3(3), 735-744. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-022-00200-5
- Robles, P., & Mallinson, D. J. (2023). Catching up with AI: Pushing toward a cohesive governance framework. *Politics and Policy*, 51(3), 355-372. https://doi.org/10.1111/polp.12529
- STIX ,C.(2021).Foundations for the Future:Institution building for the purpose of Artificial Intelligence governance. AI and Ethics Springer. DOI 10.1007/s43681-021-00093-w
- Tasriqul I, Sadia A, and Neda Z. (2024), AI in Public Governance: Ensuring Rights and Innovation in Non-High-Risk AI Systems in the United States, European Journal of Technology, Vol.8,Issue 6, pp17-27, .
- Thoom, S. R. (2025). Lessons from ai in finance: governance and compliance in practice. International Journal of Science and Research Archive, 14(1), 1387-1395. https://doi.org/10.30574/ijsra.2025.14.1.0235
- Truby, Jonathan, et al. (2021), A Sandbox Approach to Regulating High-Risk Artificial Intelligence Applications." European Journal of Risk Regulation 17, no. 4 ,1–17. doi:10.1017/err.2021.52.
- - Zetzsche, Dirk A., et al. "Regulating a Revolution: From Regulatory Sandboxes to Smart Regulation." SSRN, 2017. doi:10.2139/ssrn.3018534.
- - Zhuo Zhang, The impact of the artificial intelligence industry on the number and structure of employments in the digital economy environment. Technological forcasting and social change, december 2023,vl197. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2023.122881
-
- Szádeczky, T., & Bederna, Z. (2025). Risk, regulation, and governance: evaluating artificial intelligence across diverse

application scenarios. Security Journal, 38. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41284-025-00495-z.e

- Wirtz, B., Weyerer, J., & Sturm, B. (2020). The Dark Sides of Artificial Intelligence: An Integrated AI Governance Framework for Public Administration. International Journal of Public Administration, 43, 818 - 829. https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2020.1749851.
- Salako, A., Fabuyi, J., Aideyan, N., Selesi-Aina, O., Dapo-Oyewole, D., & Olaniyi, O. (2024). Advancing Information Governance in AI-Driven Cloud Ecosystem: Strategies for Enhancing Data Security and Meeting Regulatory Compliance. Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science. https://doi.org/10.9734/ajrcos/2024/v17i12530.
- Chikoti, S. (2025). The Critical Importance of Risk & Governance for AI Initiatives. Journal of Information Systems Engineering and Management. https://doi.org/10.52783/jisem.v10i59s.12931.