Ilomata International Journal of Social Science
P-ISSN: 2714-898X; E-ISSN: 2714-8998
Volume 6, Issue 4 October 2025
Page No. 1337-1357

Regulatory Dilemma and Innovation: A Critical Analysis of Business Law in Indonesia Facing Technological Disruption

Vivi Sylvia Purborini[1], Suryaningsih[2]
[12]Universitas Wisnuwardhana Malang, Indonesia
Correspondent: veliorapsl@gmail.com[1]

Received : June 28, 2025
Accepted : August 08, 2025
Published : October 31, 2025

Citation: Purborini and Suryaningsih. (2025). Regulatory Dilemma and Innovation: A Critical Analysis of Business Law in Indonesia Facing Technological Disruption. Ilomata International Journal of Social Science, 6(4), 1337-1357.
https://doi.org/10.61194/ijss.v6i4.1845

ABSTRACT: This study critically examines the regulatory challenges facing Indonesian business law amid rapid technological disruption, using normative legal research with a doctrinal approach. Analyzing legislation, legal principles, and academic literature, it identifies a persistent tension between legal certainty and the imperative to innovate. Indonesia's regulatory framework often trails digital transformation and global integration, producing delays that generate uncertainty for firms, weaken consumer protection, and heighten risks of unfair practices. The literature remains thin on the dynamic mismatch between evolving business models and regulatory responses, underscoring the need for studies that integrate empirical evidence with theory to inform adaptive rule-making. Cross-border transactions compound complexity, as jurisdictional overlaps constrain national authorities in cases involving transnational actors; these pressures are systemic, bearing directly on the effectiveness, legitimacy, and competitiveness of Indonesian business law. Rather than reacting after the fact, business law should act as a driver of responsible innovation—promoting growth while respecting Indonesian legal and cultural values and protecting the public interest. This requires a normative framework attentive to local socio-cultural specificities, distinct from dominant Western accounts of responsible innovation. Indonesia's capacity to navigate disruption thus depends not only on legislative reform but also on a responsive, collaborative, and inclusive legal ecosystem that is anticipatory, integrative, and resilient. The study contributes theoretically by clarifying how to design institutions that deliver legal certainty while enabling sustainable innovation, and practically by offering a foundation for policymakers to build a fair, competitive, future-ready regime.

Keywords: Business Law, Technological Disruption, Regulatory Innovation, Indonesia, Legal Reform

INTRODUCTION

The modern era is characterized by an exponential pace of technological innovation, creating fundamental disruptions across various sectors, including the business world. From e-commerce and fintech to blockchain and artificial intelligence, technology has transformed transactional landscapes, business models, and economic interactions. In Indonesia, this phenomenon of disruption brings immense opportunities for inclusive economic growth and efficiency, yet simultaneously presents a complex regulatory dilemma for policymakers and legal practitioners.? The main problem in this study is how business law in Indonesia can accommodate the rapid development of innovation without hindering creativity, while maintaining legal stability, protecting public interests, and ensuring the creation of fair business competition.

This introduction will explore the inherent tension between the need for adaptive regulation and the drive for disruptive innovation. Business law, traditionally built upon static principles and predictability, now confronts borderless digital entities and constantly evolving business models. A fundamental question arises: is existing regulation adequate, or does it, in fact, hinder innovation? On the other hand, a lack of clear regulation can also trigger significant risks, ranging from weak consumer protection and new monopolistic practices to issues of data security and money laundering (Vollmer, 2022).

This critical study will analyze how business law in Indonesia endeavors to navigate this dilemma, identifying key challenges in formulating and implementing responsive policies, and proposing a framework for achieving an optimal balance between the impetus for innovation and the necessity for effective governance in an era of technological disruption. Rapid technological developments in the digital era have disrupted conventional business practices and triggered structural transformations in economic practices, including in Indonesia. Innovations such as financial technology (fintech), e-commerce, artificial intelligence (AI), and blockchain are not only expanding business models and driving efficiency, but also posing serious challenges to legal systems designed within traditional economic contexts. This technological disruption exposes the imbalance between the pace of innovation and the law's ability to respond adaptively. Indonesia's business legal framework, often reactive and based on sectoral and administrative regulations, now faces the need to develop a more dynamic, predictive, and inclusive regulatory approach. In this context, it is crucial to reexamine the business legal paradigm to ensure it can respond to new complexities without sacrificing legal certainty, justice, and the protection of the public interest (Schwab, 2017);(Bank, 2020). Amid Indonesia's efforts toward a digital economy, a complex dilemma has emerged: how can the legal system guarantee legal certainty, consumer protection, and fair competition, while simultaneously providing regulatory space for innovation? This gap not only reflects the inadequacy of formal regulations but is also rooted in the unique characteristics of Indonesia's legal tradition, which combines elements of customary, colonial, and modern law. As argued by the theory of legal pluralism, the existence of multiple legal systems within a single country demands a contextual and flexible regulatory approach. Therefore, rigid business laws that are less responsive to the dynamics of today's digital business models demonstrate the need for reforms that take local cultural and social factors into account. This approach is not only nationally relevant but also adds a valuable dimension to the global debate on legal adaptation to technological transformation (Setiadi, 2021). Regulatory gaps have been observed in areas such as peer-to-peer lending, digital assets, and ride-hailing platforms, where either overregulation stifles innovation or underregulation risks public harm (OECD, 2021).

This tension between regulatory control and technological flexibility reflects a broader global debate over the future of regulatory governance in the digital age. While some scholars argue for agile legal frameworks and regulatory sandboxes to support innovation (Zetzsche, D. A., Buckley, R. P., Arner, D. W., & Barberis, 2017). others caution against the potential for exploitation and systemic risk without clear legal boundaries (Zetzsche, D. A., Buckley, R. P., Arner, D. W., & Barberis, 2017). In Indonesia, the law often lags behind innovation, resulting in regulatory uncertainty that affects both investors and the public (Yudhistira, M. H., & Wicaksono, 2022) .

Technological Disruption in Indonesia

The development of digital technology has driven massive transformations in various sectors of life, including the business sector in Indonesia. Innovations such as e-commerce, financial technology (fintech), blockchain, and artificial intelligence have transformed the way businesses operate, interact with consumers, and compete in the global market. On the one hand, this disruption presents new economic growth opportunities, drives efficiency, and creates more inclusive business models. However, on the other hand, this rapid change is often not matched by adequate regulatory readiness and legal infrastructure. As a result, various legal issues arise, ranging from personal data protection and technology misuse to unethical business practices.

Challenges in Business Law

The business legal framework in Indonesia tends to be reactive and slow to respond to technological dynamics. This regulatory lag creates significant legal uncertainty, not only for businesses but also for consumers and investors. In practice, businesses often face confusion in complying with outdated legal norms, while consumers often lack maximum protection in digital transactions. This situation is exacerbated by weak coordination between law enforcement agencies and limitations in addressing cross-jurisdictional issues, such as those common in cross-border digital transactions.

The Gap between Innovation and Regulation

The tension between the need for legal certainty and the drive for continuous innovation is a central issue in the development of business law. When regulations are too rigid, innovation is hampered; however, when laws are too permissive, the risk of abuse and injustice increases. Unfortunately, the business law literature in Indonesia is still limited in exploring the dynamics of this discrepancy in depth. This indicates the need for normative studies that not only analyze existing regulations but also propose a new regulatory framework capable of accommodating technological change in an adaptive and responsible manner.

The Urgency of Responsive and Contextual Legal Reform

To address the challenges mentioned above, a legal approach is needed that is not only oriented towards regulatory adjustments but also takes into account local social and cultural values. The concept of "responsible innovation" in global regulatory theory cannot simply be applied in Indonesia without adjustments. Therefore, a more inclusive, collaborative, and resilient business legal framework is needed, capable of being a driving force for national economic development while protecting the public interest.

In the face of ever-evolving technological disruption, a critical study is needed to evaluate the extent to which Indonesian business law is able to effectively respond to these challenges. This evaluation will include not only an analysis of past and ongoing legislative reforms but also an examination of the judicial response in handling disputes related to digital innovation and the policy direction taken by the government in formulating adaptive regulations. Such research is crucial for assessing the capacity of the national legal system to build a business legal framework that is not only responsive to change but also anticipatory of future technological developments, while maintaining the principles of legal certainty, consumer protection, and fair business competition.

METHOD

This study uses a normative legal research method (doctrinal legal research) because this approach allows for a systematic analysis of applicable legal norms and their suitability to the challenges posed by technological disruption. This method was chosen to examine the structure and principles of existing business law, including statutory provisions, jurisprudence, and legal doctrine, in order to assess the extent to which the current legal framework is able to respond to rapidly evolving technological innovations. In the context of technological disruption, which often presents new legal issues beyond the scope of existing regulations, a normative approach is crucial for identifying regulatory gaps, interpreting relevant legal principles, and offering a conceptual foundation for business law reform in Indonesia (Utomo, B., & Rahayu, 2023).

The doctrinal legal research in this study was conducted through a literature review that included the identification, collection, and analysis of primary and secondary legal sources. Primary legal sources include national laws and regulations relevant to business and technology law, as well as court decisions related to legal issues in the context of digital disruption. Meanwhile, secondary legal sources include scientific literature, expert opinions, legal theories, and doctrines that support the analytical framework. Data were analyzed through a process of legal interpretation to assess the consistency and adequacy of applicable norms, and through legal systematization to identify regulatory gaps, overlapping norms, or the need for regulatory reformulation. In this context, the analysis was conducted thematically to link existing norms to the concrete challenges posed by technological innovation in the Indonesian business sector (Marzuki, 2021).

The primary objective of this approach is to understand "what the law is" within the domain under scrutiny and how it interacts with the phenomenon of innovation. This research combines conceptual and legislative approaches to produce a comprehensive analysis of Indonesian business law's readiness and response to technological disruption. A conceptual approach plays a crucial role in formulating a theoretical framework that serves as a basis for understanding and evaluating the legal challenges that arise with the development of digital technology. In this context, a conceptual approach not only examines the formal definitions of terms such as "regulation," "innovation," "technological disruption," and "business law" but also explores the normative and functional relationships between these concepts. This understanding is crucial because technological disruption often transcends existing regulatory boundaries and creates legal dilemmas, such as the tension between regulatory flexibility and legal certainty, or between consumer protection and freedom of innovation. A study of modern legal theories, such as responsive regulation, legal pluralism, and techno-regulation, is used to assess the extent to which the law can adapt without losing its legitimacy and effectiveness (Vollmer, 2022) .

Thus, a conceptual approach underpins efforts to restructure the basic principles of business law to ensure their relevance in the digital age.

On the other hand, a legislative approach is used to examine Indonesia's positive legal framework to identify whether existing regulations are capable of accommodating the development of disruptive digital technology. This approach includes a legal analysis of various laws and regulations governing the digital business sector, such as the Electronic Information and Transactions Law (ITE Law), the Personal Data Protection Law (PDP Law), and sectoral regulations such as the Financial Services Authority (OJK) Regulations and Bank Indonesia provisions governing financial technology (fintech). Furthermore, regulations related to e-commerce, digital consumer protection, and competition provisions in the context of the platform economy are analyzed. Through this approach, the research critically examines the alignment between legal instruments, their consistency with business law principles, and their suitability for addressing new issues raised by disruptive technology, such as algorithm authorization, platform legal liability, cross-border data management, and digital transaction certainty.

The integration of conceptual and legislative approaches allows the analysis to go beyond descriptive analysis of existing norms and also link these norms to the dynamics of evolving technology and the potential for needed legal reforms. Thus, this approach supports the main objective of the research, namely to evaluate the gap between existing regulations and future legal needs in the context of digital disruption, as well as to formulate the direction of business law reform that is more responsive, inclusive, and anticipatory to changes in the times. (Vollmer, 2022).Concurrently, the statute approach is applied to identify and critically examine various Indonesian laws and regulations pertaining to business law in the digital era, such as the Electronic Information and Transactions Law (UU ITE), the Personal Data Protection Law (UU PDP) (Undang-Undang Nomor 27 Tahun 2022 Tentang Perlindungan Data Pribadi, n.d.), digital financial sector regulations (fintech) issued by the Financial Services Authority (OJK) and Bank Indonesia, and regulations concerning e-commerce and business competition (Peraturan Otoritas Jasa Keuangan Nomor 13/POJK.02/2018 Tentang Inovasi Keuangan Digital Di Sektor Jasa Keuanga, 2020)(Indonesia, 2020). This analysis aims to evaluate if and how existing regulations can accommodate innovation, as well as to identify potential legal vacuums, overlaps, or regulatory hurdles that may arise.

This research relies on primary, secondary, and tertiary legal materials. Primary legal materials include: The 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, The Civil Code (KUHPerdata) and the Commercial Code (KUHD), Law No. 11 of 2008 concerning Electronic Information and

Transactions, as amended by Law No. 19 of 2016 and Law No. 1 of 2024, Law No. 27 of 2022 concerning Personal Data Protection, Regulations of the Financial Services Authority (POJK) and Bank Indonesia (PBI) governing the digital financial sector, fintech, and digital banking, Regulations related to e-commerce, business competition, and investment, Relevant court decisions on digital business cases (if available and pertinent to regulatory dilemmas). Secondary legal materials include: Textbooks on business law, information technology law, and economic law. Scholarly journals, articles, and other publications relevant to the topic of regulatory dilemmas and innovation (Sugeng, S., Tobing, C. I., & Fajarwati, 2020). Research reports, seminar proceedings, and expert discussions. Tertiary legal materials serve as supporting resources, such as legal dictionaries, indexes, and encyclopedias. Legal material collection is conducted through library research. This involves the identification, tracing, collection, reading, note-taking, and systematization of relevant legal materials (Nazir, 2014). The analysis of legal materials in this study was conducted using a critical analytical approach and qualitative descriptive methods. The qualitative descriptive approach was applied by systematically collecting and compiling primary legal materials (such as laws, government regulations, and court decisions) and secondary legal materials (such as scientific literature, expert opinions, and legal doctrine) to describe the legal framework governing business in the digital era. This process included categorizing legal norms based on specific legal themes or issues, such as data protection, digital platform obligations, and business competition in the technology sector.

Next, critical analytical methods were used to assess the legal substance in depth. This analysis included examining internal consistency between provisions within a single legal regime, as well as external consistency between different but interrelated legal regimes, such as the ITE Law, the PDP Law, and fintech regulations from the Financial Services Authority (OJK) and Bank Indonesia. This research also examined the extent to which existing regulations are relevant to developments in innovative technology and identified potential overlaps, legal vacuums, or misalignments between legal principles and practical needs. Critical analysis is carried out not only from a normative perspective, but also considering the socio-technological context behind the birth of regulations, to understand whether the prevailing norms are able to answer the challenges of technological disruption substantively and functionally.

This also includes evaluating the effectiveness of existing regulations in achieving their objectives amidst technological disruption. Descriptive-Qualitative: The analysis findings will be described narratively and qualitatively to explain the phenomenon of regulatory dilemmas and innovation, and to present the research arguments and findings comprehensively. This research will identify how business law in Indonesia attempts to navigate the dilemma between fostering innovation and maintaining stability and protection. The analytical results are expected to provide recommendations for more adaptive and responsive legal reforms to the dynamics of technology.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

This research analyzes the inherent dilemma between the need for adaptive regulation and the drive for disruptive innovation in Indonesian business law. Employing a normative approach, we examined how the existing legal framework responds to rapid technological change, identified challenges, and proposed solutions. Responsive Legal Frameworks: Adopting a responsive or anticipatory legal approach is essential. Drawing on Nonet and Selznick's Responsive Law, a proactive legal framework can help integrate autonomous and algorithmic decision-making (Nonet, P., & Selznick, 2001).

This study aims to explore the tension between the need for flexible regulations that adapt quickly to technological developments and the strong push for disruptive innovation in the realm of business law in Indonesia. Using a normative approach, this study examines the capacity of the current legal system to respond to the acceleration of digital transformation, particularly in strategic sectors such as digital financial services (fintech), e-commerce, and artificial intelligence. The findings indicate that existing regulations tend to be reactive and are not fully able to address the complexities brought about by technological advances. Therefore, a responsive legal approach, as developed by Nonet and Selznick, is highly relevant. This approach emphasizes the importance of law as a mechanism capable of progressively interpreting social and technological changes. By adopting an anticipatory and adaptive legal framework, policymakers can be better prepared to accommodate algorithmic decision-making models while still ensuring legal certainty, accountability, and protection for the public.

Business Law Regulation in Indonesia: An Overview

Indonesian business law is built on a strong foundation, inherited from the civil law tradition and enriched by various specific regulations relevant to commercial activities. Generally, business law regulation covers aspects ranging from the establishment of business entities, contracts, collateral, capital markets, business competition, to bankruptcy. The Civil Code (KUHPerdata) and the Commercial Code (KUHD) serve as primary pillars, complemented by various sectoral laws such as the Limited Liability Company Law (UU PT), Capital Market Law, and Consumer Protection Law. However, in the modern era, these regulations continually adapt to the emergence of new technologies. For instance, the rise of e-commerce led to the enactment of the Electronic Information and Transactions Law (UU ITE), which governs the validity of electronic transactions and data protection. The financial sector has also undergone deregulation and re-regulation with the advent of fintech, which is governed by Financial Services Authority Regulations (POJK) and Bank Indonesia Regulations (PBI) (OJK, 2020; Bank Indonesia, 2020). Nevertheless, the speed of innovation often far outpaces the legislature's ability to respond, creating a significant regulatory lag (Schwab, 2017). This phenomenon is recognized as a serious challenge for regulatory governance in the digital era, where rules often fall behind practice (Brownsword, 2017).

The primary legal foundations are the Indonesian Civil Code, Commercial Code, and Law No. 40/2007 on Limited Liability Companies (LLC), which govern legal entities such as PT (Limited Liability Company), partnerships, and cooperatives. Foreign investors are required to establish a Foreign Investment Company (PT PMA), governed by the Indonesia Investment Coordinating Board (BKPM), with specific restrictions and requirements (Hawin, M., Butt, S., & Setianingrum, 2023).

In addition to national laws, regional regulations (Perda) apply based on Law No. 12/2011, creating a layered regulatory environment. The Omnibus Law on Job Creation (Law No. 11/2020) and its amendments through Government Regulation in Lieu of Law (Perppu) 2022 and Law No. 6/2023 reformed multiple sectors, including licensing, employment, and investment (Arrizal, N. Z., Kharisma, B. U., & Nur, 2021).

Regulatory Developments and Key Reforms: The Omnibus Law aims to streamline bureaucracy and attract investment but faces criticism regarding labor rights and environmental protection. Risk-Based Licensing and OSS: Government Regulation No. 24/2018 and No. 5/2021 introduced Online Single Submission (OSS), a system for risk-based licensing. (Rachmania, S. N., Sukarmi, & Hadiyantina, 2025). Found OSS improved efficiency but faced technical and human resource challenges. Digital Business and Contract Law: The digital economy demands adaptation of contract law, especially regarding electronic contracts, online dispute resolution, and smart contracts (Rohaya, N., Sinulingga, D. B., & Mutiara, 2023). A new National Contract Law is recommended to accommodate such needs. Foreign Investment and Local Incorporation: (Hawin, M., Butt, S., & Setianingrum, 2023). Reviewed the mandatory establishment of local entities (PT PMA) for foreign investors, highlighting the need to revise Negative Investment Lists and strengthen local legal frameworks. Digital Investment and Data Localization: (Oktaviandra, 2024). Addressed legal loopholes in digital investment regulation and emphasized the need for reforms in data localization and cross-border e-commerce regulation. Corporate Governance and Competition Law: (Baiquni, M. I., & Waspiah, 2023). Assessed the evolution of Indonesia's competition law, noting significant progress in anti-monopoly enforcement. (Iramani, R. R., Mongid, A., & Muazaroh, 2021). Advocated updating corporate law to better implement Good Corporate Governance (GCG) mechanisms. Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Regulation: (Haliwela, N. S., & Chansrakaeo, 2024). Analyzed CSR as a legal obligation under both the Company Law and Foreign Investment Law, yet criticized its often superficial implementation.

Challenges and Opportunities

Key Challenge	Impact	Policy Solution
Overlapping and complex regulations	Slows down business registration	Continue simplifying regulations and synchronizing national–regional policies
Unadapted laws in digital context	Contractual ambiguity, weak data protection	Revise ITE Law and adopt new contract law
Tension between labor protection and business flexibility	Labor protests and investor hesitance	Reassess labor provisions in Job Creation Law
Weak oversight and corruption	Undermines legal effectiveness	Strengthen digital governance and regulatory enforcement
Restrictive foreign ownership	Deters FDI inflow	Review DNI and offer better investment terms

Policy Recommendations: Revise contract law to cover e-contracts, digital signatures, and online dispute mechanisms. Improve OSS implementation through infrastructure upgrades and staff training. Update digital investment rules to address cross-border data and e-commerce issues. Synchronize local and national regulations to reduce jurisdictional conflicts. Strengthen GCG frameworks in corporate law, emphasizing accountability. Review foreign investment regulations, balancing natio nal interest with global competitiveness(Baldwin, R., Cave, M., & Lodge, 2012).

Indonesia's business law framework, anchored by the Consumer Protection Act (Law No. 8/1999), Electronic Information and Transactions Act (Law No. 11/2008 jo. 19/2016), and the Financial Services Authority Act (Law No. 21/2011), has traditionally reflected administrative and punitive tendencies (Butt, 2020). Although these laws set foundational protections, they readily encounter ambiguity and interpretative inconsistency when confronted with fintech, blockchain, or AI innovations. The rule based nature of Indonesian regulation often lacks flexibility, resulting in legal uncertainty for disruptive technologies (De Filippi, P., & Hassan, 2018). Notably, the implementation of regulatory sandboxes—such as BI's PBI No. 19/12/PBI/2017 and OJK's POJK No. 13/POJK.02/2018—demonstrates early attempts to harmonize regulatory certainty with innovation (Martiniasih, N., & Saravistha, 2021).

Challenges for Business Law in Indonesia in the Modern Era

Emerging phenomena like NFTs and smart contracts often operate in juridical voids. Indonesia's existing laws (e.g., ITE, Personal Data Protection Bill) are overly broad and failing to address these novel developments (De Filippi, P., & Hassan, 2018). Disruptive technological developments have posed several crucial challenges for business law in Indonesia: a. Regulatory Lag and Legal Vacuums. Technological innovation, particularly DeFi and cryptocurrencies, advances at a pace that far exceeds regulatory responsiveness. Such imbalance has led to regulatory vacuum and legal exposure for providers and users (Arner, D. W., Buckley, R. P., Zetzsche, D. A., & Veidt, 2020). The rapid pace of innovation, such as blockchain, the metaverse, or artificial intelligence, often surpasses the capacity of lawmakers to create relevant and comprehensive regulatory frameworks(Partners, 2024). This leads to legal vacuums or inadequate regulations, causing uncertainty for businesses and difficulties in law enforcement For example, specific regulations for blockchain-based smart contract transactions remain very limited, despite their vast potential use. The inability of regulations to keep pace with innovation creates grey areas that platforms exploit or leads to unexpected risks (Gürkaynak, G., Yilmaz, O., & Yenidogan, 2018). b. Consumer and Data Protection. The digital era opens new avenues for personal data exploitation and consumer rights infringements. Although Indonesia has enacted the Personal Data Protection Law (UU PDP), its implementation and enforcement still require strengthening, particularly given the complexity of cross-border data flows and the business practices of giant digital platforms (Law No. 27 of 2022). Consumers are vulnerable to online fraud, unfair business practices, and data misuse without a robust protective framework, necessitating a more proactive approach from regulators(Utomo, B., & Rahayu, 2023) c. Business Competition and Digital Monopolies. The development of the platform economy tends to create dominant players with massive market power, potentially leading to monopolistic or oligopolistic practices detrimental to healthy competition. Existing competition law may not be fully adaptive to address the unique challenges of algorithms, data-driven pricing, or network effects that reinforce market dominance (Tapscott, D., & Tapscott, 2016). This challenge is compounded by the lack of adequate economic analysis frameworks to assess the anti-competitive impact of large technology companies (Khan, 2017). d. Jurisdiction and Cross-Border Law Enforcement. Many digital business transactions are cross-jurisdictional, leading to difficulties in determining applicable law and enforcement mechanisms. For instance, how does one address fraud perpetrated by entities operating from abroad but harming consumers in Indonesia? This demands closer international legal cooperation and adaptation of traditional jurisdictional principles (Koops, B. J., Leenes, R., & van der Sloot, 2017). This complexity is even more pronounced in cross-border digital transaction disputes involving multiple jurisdictions and legal systems (Susilo, B., & Hidayat, 2021).

Implications of Technological Developments for Business Law Development in Indonesia

The increasingly rapid development of digital technology presents new challenges for the legal system in Indonesia, particularly in the realm of business law. One key impact is a shift in the regulatory paradigm from a prescriptive approach where the law sets strict boundaries to a more adaptive approach to social and economic dynamics. In the Indonesian context, the legal system, which tends to be formalistic and hierarchical, often fails to keep pace with the pace of innovation in sectors such as fintech, e-commerce, and artificial intelligence. Therefore, a reformulation of the regulatory approach is needed that not only prioritizes legal certainty but is also flexible in accommodating change. The law must transform into an instrument that can understand context, respond to societal needs, and sustainably support the digital business ecosystem, without sacrificing the principles of justice and legal protection (Fenwick, M., Kaal, W. A., & Vermeulen, 2019).

Technological advancements have profound implications for the development of business law: a. Paradigm Shift from Prescriptive to Adaptive Regulation. Law can no longer be merely prescriptive (prohibiting what is not allowed) but must be more adaptive and responsive. This means promoting a principles-based regulation approach or a regulatory sandbox that allows innovation to develop within safe boundaries before formal regulations are imposed(Sunstein, 2013). This approach enables regulators to learn while innovating, avoiding premature regulations that might hinder growth (Baldwin, R., Cave, M., & Lodge, 2012) b. Need for Enhanced Capacity of Law Enforcement and Regulators. The complexity of technology necessitates increased technical capacity and legal understanding for law enforcement officials, judges, prosecutors, and legal advisors. Without adequate understanding, enforcing laws against cybercrimes or digital business disputes will be extremely difficult. Specialized training and multidisciplinary skill development are crucial (Priestley, J. M., & Susanti, 2023) c. Multi-stakeholder Collaboration in Regulatory Formulation. Given the speed and complexity of innovation, regulatory formulation can no longer be the exclusive domain of the government. Active involvement from academics, industry practitioners, business associations, and civil society in the legislative process is crucial to produce inclusive and effective regulations. Approaches like co-regulation or participatory regulation can be highly relevant models (Black, 2008). d. Focus on Ethics and Sustainability. Technological disruption also raises deep ethical questions, such as privacy, algorithmic bias, and the social responsibility of digital companies. The development of business law in the modern era must integrate Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) principles and ethics to ensure that innovation serves the public good, not just financial gain. The concepts of ethical AI and responsible innovation are increasingly urgent to be integrated into legal frameworks (Floridi, L., Cowls, J., Beltrametti, M., Chatila, R., Chazerand, P., Dignum, V., ... & Vayena, 2018).

The rapid advancement of technology has become a major driver of global economic transformation, including in Indonesia. However, one of the main challenges is how legislation can keep pace with technological changes without hindering innovation. Rigid regulations, slow legislative processes, and a lack of technical understanding among policymakers often turn the law into a barrier rather than a facilitator of growth in the digital economy. One of the most critical challenges is regulatory lag—the gap between technological innovation and the development of relevant legal frameworks. In digital economic sectors such as fintech, e-commerce, blockchain, and artificial intelligence, delayed or overly restrictive regulations can discourage investment, create legal uncertainty, and push businesses to operate in legal grey areas. Conversely, overly lax regulations without adequate consumer and data protection can introduce new risks to economic and social stability. Another challenge lies in inter-agency coordination. Many technological innovations cut across sectors, while our regulatory approach remains siloed and bureaucratic. This leads to overlapping authorities and conflicting policies(Kusuma, D., & Rachmawati, 2020).

Therefore, in my view, a more pro-innovation, adaptive, and principle-based regulatory approach is urgently needed. Future regulations must be dynamic, collaborative, and risk-based. Governments should actively develop regulatory sandboxes to test new policies in controlled environments before broader implementation. In addition, collaboration among policymakers, industry players, academics, and civil society is key to ensuring that law serves as a foundation for sustainable innovation and economic growth. In short, the greatest challenge is not only to create regulations quickly, but to create smart regulations—regulations that are capable of responding to future needs without compromising justice, legal certainty, and public protection.

Solutions for Addressing Technological Disruption in Indonesian Business Law

Based on several studies and policy evaluations, it is clear that Indonesia's legal framework is not fully prepared to address the implications of technological disruption. Many regulations lag behind in responding to the pace of digital innovation, resulting in legal uncertainty, weak consumer protection, and potential conflicts between legal norms and new technological practices. Therefore, solutions must be designed sectorally, considering the varying characteristics and challenges of each sector.

Financial Technology (Fintech) Sector

In the fintech sector, the emergence of new models such as peer-to-peer lending, crowdfunding, and digital assets has transformed patterns of financial interaction. Findings indicate that regulations tend to be experimental and sometimes lack a clear legal basis.

Solution: A dynamic, principles-based legal framework is needed that can adapt to evolving business models. Collaboration between the Financial Services Authority (OJK) and industry players must be facilitated on an ongoing basis, including through a regulatory sandbox that allows for the testing of innovations without direct legal risk. Consumer protection and data transparency must be key principles in the development of new regulations.

Electronic Commerce (E-Commerce) Sector

The rapid growth of e-commerce poses challenges related to consumer protection, transaction security, and jurisdictional clarity in cross-border transactions. Findings indicate that legal protection for consumers remains weak, particularly regarding the right to personal data and digital dispute resolution.

Solution: Regulations are needed to strengthen, emphasizing digital platform accountability, information transparency, and clarity in legal responsibilities. Furthermore, harmonization of the Consumer Protection Law, the Electronic Information and Transactions Law, and ASEAN digital trade policies needs to be integrated. Online dispute resolution mechanisms must also be further developed.

Artificial Intelligence (AI) Sector

The use of AI in business processes, such as decision automation, predictive analytics, and chatbot-based customer service, raises new legal dilemmas, such as legal liability for algorithmic errors and system bias. Current Indonesian regulations do not explicitly regulate the use of AI in the business world.

Solution: The development of ethical guidelines and a legal framework regarding the use of AI in business activities is necessary. The government can formulate basic principles such as algorithmic transparency, accountability, and non-discrimination. Strengthening regulatory capacity and establishing new technology oversight bodies are also crucial to prevent abuse and maintain fairness in automated systems.

Digital Labor Sector

Digital work platforms (gig economy), such as online motorcycle taxi services or freelance platforms, have created forms of employment relationships that are not common within the conventional labor law system. Many digital workers do not receive the same protections as formal workers.

Solution: Labor regulations need to be expanded to accommodate digital work. Minimum protections such as social security, occupational safety, and the right to a living wage must be regulated flexibly but firmly. The government also needs to develop an adaptive policy framework that balances work flexibility and adequate legal protection for platform workers.

Addressing technological disruption in Indonesian business law cannot be achieved through a single approach. Solutions must be sector-based, evidence-based, and involve various stakeholders.

The application of adaptive, participatory, and proactive legal principles is key to creating a regulatory ecosystem that supports the growth of innovation while ensuring fair and sustainable legal protection. To address the dilemma of regulation and innovation, several strategic solutions can be implemented: a. Adoption of Agile Regulatory Approaches. The government needs to adopt an agile regulatory approach, allowing for rapid adaptation to technological changes. This could include: Regulatory Sandboxes: Controlled environments where innovative products and services can be tested without being subject to all existing regulations, allowing regulators to understand new technologies before formulating final rules (Peraturan Otoritas Jasa Keuangan Nomor 13/POJK.02/2018 Tentang Inovasi Keuangan Digital Di Sektor Jasa Keuanga, 2020). This model has been successfully implemented in several countries to foster fintech innovation (Buckley, R. P., Arner, D. W., & Zetzsche, 2016). PrinciplesBased Regulation: Establishing general principles that must be adhered to, giving innovators flexibility to develop new solutions as long as they comply with those principles. Ex Post Regulation: Allowing innovation to develop first, and formulating regulations after understanding its impacts and risks, but with proactive oversight mechanisms (Brownsword, 2017) b. Human Resources Capacity Building. Investment in training and education for regulators, judges, prosecutors, and legal advisors to understand new technologies (e.g., artificial intelligence, blockchain, cybersecurity) and their legal implications is essential. Collaboration with universities and technology experts can accelerate this process (Priestley, J. M., & Susanti, 2023). The establishment of specialized units focused on law and technology can also be considered. c. Strengthening Data Protection and Cybersecurity Frameworks. While the PDP Law already exists, its enforcement and public awareness campaigns need to be intensified. Furthermore, a stronger legal and policy framework for cybersecurity in business transactions is required, including industry standards and incident response mechanisms (Setiadi, E., & Sari, 2022). The implementation of a comprehensive data governance framework, covering legal, technical, and organizational aspects, becomes a priority. d. Fostering Multi-stakeholder Collaboration and Inclusive Dialogue. The continuous establishment of regulatory forums involving government, the technology industry, academia, and civil society can ensure that the resulting regulations are relevant, balanced, and enforceable. This approach allows policymakers to gain direct insights from innovators and understand operational challenges. e. Legal Harmonization and International Cooperation(Syahrina, 2020). Given the cross-border nature of digital technology, Indonesia needs to actively participate in legal harmonization at regional (ASEAN) and global levels. International cooperation agreements on cybersecurity law enforcement and data protection are crucial to addressing cross-border crimes(Koops, B. J., Leenes, R., & van der Sloot, 2017). Active participation in international forums like UNCITRAL and UNIDROIT can facilitate the development of globally relevant legal principles.Enforcement becomes problematic when regulatory bodies apply legacy legal frameworks to digital phenomena, often stretching legal interpretations to their limits (Tisnadibrata, 2021). Business models such as ride-hailing and algorithmic pricing challenge conventional competition law, requiring dynamic enforcement frameworks (Bamberger, K. A., & Lobel, 2017);(Clack, C. D., Bakshi, V. A., & Braine, 2016). Re-conceptualizing Contracts: De Filippi and Hassan (2018) illustrate how smart contracts shift from "code is law" to "law is code," embedding legal norms directly in machine-readable code . define a smart contract as "an automatable and enforceable agreement" grounded in law code alignment, highlighting how Ricardian Contract methodology creates legal bridges between prose and code. Electronic Contract Validity: Article 18 of the ITE Law continues to fuel debates over digital consent and proof-of-intent, with disputes emerging in Indonesian courts(Gunawan, 2020).

Solutions to Technological Disruption in Business Law

1.Agile, Technology-Neutral Regulation Legislation must be risk-based and technology-neutral, mirroring principles of the EU Digital Services Act and UNCITRAL MLETR (Schulze, R., & Staudenmayer, (De Filippi, P., & Hassan, 2018); (UNCITRAL, 2017). 2. Regulatory Sandboxes & Institutional Coordination Indonesia's sandboxes have enabled fintech experimentation but must evolve through greater coordina(Wirtz, B. W., & Müller, 2019). Tion across BI, OJK, and Bappebti to avoid jurisdictional overlaps(Kusuma, D., & Rachmawati, 2020);(Martiniasih, N., & Saravistha, 2021). 3. Smart Contracts via Legal-Technical Integration Smart Contract Templates (Clack et al., 2016) advocate a hybrid legal–technical platform where legal intent is embedded in machine-executable code. This demands legal recognition of code-based agreements (Clack, C. D., Bakshi, V. A., & Braine, 2016). 4. Digital Enforcement through E Justice and Legal Tech. Adoption of e courts, AI based evidence systems, and online dispute resolution mechanisms can enhance judicial capacity to resolve digital business conflicts(Ramadhani, N., Nandani, D. R., Arrizki, F., 2023). 5. Multi Stakeholder Co Regulation Engaging government, industry associations, legal scholars, and civil society fosters inclusive, evidence-based policymaking. Indonesia can follow frameworks like arts.5 co-regulation endorsed by Ali & Salim (2021) and Nasution (2023) (European Commission, 2022). As an observer of the dynamic interplay between law and technology, I believe that solutions for addressing modern technological developments in Indonesian business law aren't just about creating new regulations. More than that, it's about revolutionizing the way we think and act towards regulation itself. The challenge we face today isn't lagging regulation, but rather the need for agile and adaptive regulation.

The key to addressing legal challenges in the digital age lies in a paradigm shift from a rigid command-and-control approach to a more collaborative, principles-based one. Indonesia's legal system has historically tended to be reactive and overly detailed in regulating every normative aspect. However, amidst the unpredictable acceleration of technological innovation, this approach is no longer adequate. A lack of flexibility can actually hinder the law's adaptation to evolving new realities. Therefore, adopting a regulatory approach that is adaptive, open to multi-sector dialogue, and based on universal values is increasingly urgent within the modern business legal framework. We can no longer wait for technology to emerge, observe its impacts, and only then formulate regulations that are already outdated even before implementation. The first crucial point is the maximum utilization of regulatory sandboxes. I'm personally very optimistic about the regulatory sandboxes already being implemented, especially in the financial sector. These are legal laboratories where innovation can be tested in a controlled environment. The benefits are twofold: regulators can understand new technologies in real-time, and businesses gain clarity to innovate without being hampered by irrelevant rules. However, these sandboxes must be expanded to other disrupted sectors, not just fintech. This flexibility will foster creativity without sacrificing protection.

Second, enhancing the capacity of human resources within regulatory and law enforcement bodies is absolutely vital. This isn't just about sending them to technical training. It's about building a continuous learning ecosystem that involves universities, technology experts, and the industry. Judges, prosecutors, and investigators must possess a deep understanding of how technology works, not just its outcomes. Without this understanding, court decisions or investigation processes could become deadlocked or even stifle genuinely beneficial innovation. In my opinion, special teams within legal institutions should be dedicated to cutting-edge legal tech research and analysis.

Third, and this is what I emphasize most, is a culture of inclusive multi-stakeholder collaboration. The government cannot formulate regulations alone. The industry best understands the dynamics of innovation. Academics can provide theoretical frameworks and critical analysis. Civil society represents public and consumer interests. Regular, transparent, and substantive dialogue forums among all these parties will result in regulations that are more balanced, relevant, and enforceable. This will foster a sense of shared ownership over solutions, rather than mere forced compliance.

Fourth, we must think of legal harmonization and international cooperation as an integral part of the solution. Business transactions in the digital age know no national borders. Cyber fraud or data disputes can involve entities in multiple jurisdictions. Therefore, Indonesia needs to be an active player in international forums to develop cross-border digital legal principles. This will provide greater legal certainty for businesses operating globally and strengthen our law enforcement capabilities.

The most fundamental aspect in responding to technological disruption is the internalization of ethical and sustainability principles in every form of innovation and regulatory formulation. Amidst the rapid flow of digitalization, it is important to remember that technology is merely a means; its ultimate impact is determined by how society and the state regulate it. In the Indonesian context, where digital transformation often occurs faster than the legislative process, there is a risk that innovation is allowed to develop without an adequate ethical and environmental framework. Therefore, modern business law must act not only as a regulator but also as a balance, ensuring that technological development remains grounded in humanitarian values, social justice, and ecological sustainability. These principles need to be explicitly integrated into regulations, industrial policies, and oversight mechanisms, so that technological advancements can bring long-term benefits to society and future generations.Finally, and perhaps most fundamentally, is the internalization of ethical and sustainability principles into every innovation and regulation. Technology is a tool; how we use it is a choice. Business law in the modern era must ensure that innovation serves humanity and the environment, not the other way around. This means regulation must be capable of preventing algorithmic bias, ensuring data privacy, and promoting the social responsibility of digital companies. Strong nationalism in the modern era must mean building a digital economy that is fair, inclusive, and sustainable. Personally, I believe Indonesia has great potential to become a leader in this aspect of business law in the digital age, provided we dare to move beyond old frameworks and embrace a more agile, collaborative, and visionary regulatory strategy. In my view, Indonesia stands at a critical crossroads between maintaining a traditionally rigid legal structure and responding to the rapid, disruptive nature of modern technological innovations. Many of our legal responses have been reactive, introduced only after significant public harm has occurred such as in the rise of illegal online lending, personal data leaks, or disputes surrounding digital contracts. To move forward effectively, the following are key strategic solutions I believe are both urgent and implementable: 1. Adopt Risk-Based, Technology-Neutral Legislation. Overly specific regulations based on a certain technology tend to become outdated rapidly. Therefore, the future of business law in Indonesia should be rooted in general principles that are adaptable and risk-based. For example, rather than regulating only "fintech payment systems," regulations should establish clear legal standards for consumer protection, data governance, and transparency that apply across various digital business models regardless of their technological basis. 2. Establish an Integrated and Coordinated Regulatory Sandbox. Currently, regulatory sandboxes exist under both Bank Indonesia and the Financial Services Authority (OJK). However, they operate independently, creating confusion and inefficiency. An inter-institutional sandbox that integrates regulatory actors including Bappebti (Commodities Futures Regulator), KPPU (Competition Authority), and the Ministry of Communication and Information will provide startups and innovators with a clear, unified legal testbed for emerging technologies. 3. Upgrade Enforcement Infrastructure and Digital Evidence Recognition. The legal system must be equipped to recognize and process smart contracts, electronic signatures, and digital evidence. This includes: Expanding and upgrading e-court systems, Legally recognizing automated notarial acts and online mediation/arbitration, and Establishing digital evidence standards that are accepted by Indonesian courts. 4. Develop Human Capital in Legal-Tech Competency. Even the best regulations will be ineffective if legal professionals are unprepared to interpret or enforce them. Indonesia must invest in capacity-building programs for judges, prosecutors, legal drafters, and regulators. These should cover topics such as blockchain legality, AI in legal reasoning, digital forensics, and data protection law. 5. Promote Multi-Stakeholder Co-Regulation. The process of formulating digital business law must be inclusive, involving not only government agencies but also: Technology entrepreneurs and startup associations, Civil society watchdogs and consumer advocacy groups, Academics and legal researchers in cyber law and business law, Industry technologists and ethical hackers. This will ensure that regulations are not only legally sound but also socially accepted, economically feasible, and technologically current.

Strategic Policy Framework: Technical Formulation

To realize these solutions, the following technical policy roadmap is proposed:

Focus Area	**Strategic Objective**	**Policy Instruments**	**Responsible Entities**
Legal Reform	Create adaptive, risk-based legal frameworks	Revise Law No. 11/2008 (ITE Law), Enact Smart Contract Law, Update Consumer Protection Law	Ministry of Law and Human Rights, DPR RI
Institutional Innovation	Build unified sandbox and innovation licensing regime	Presidential Decree on Inter-Agency Sandbox Integration	BI, OJK, Bappebti, Kominfo

Focus Area	Strategic Objective	Policy Instruments	Responsible Entities
Judicial Digitalization	Strengthen e-Court and digital enforcement systems	Supreme Court Regulation on Smart Contract Evidence, Online Mediation Rules	MA (Supreme Court), KemenPANRB
Capacity Building	Improve law enforcement's legal-tech literacy	National Training Programs (CPD for judges, prosecutors, etc.)	BPHN, Kominfo, Supreme Court Training Center
Stakeholder Engagement	Institutionalize public participation in tech regulation	Multi-stakeholder Roundtables, Public Consultation Portals	Kominfo, DPR RI, CSOs

The "Regulatory Dilemma and Innovation" in Indonesian business law facing technological disruption is, to me, one of the most fascinating and critical challenges of our time. It's a high-stakes balancing act between fostering rapid innovation and ensuring stability, fairness, and protection for all stakeholders. My personal take is that Indonesia is at a crucial juncture where we must move beyond reactive regulation and embrace a more proactive and adaptive legal philosophy. The core of the dilemma lies in the inherent mismatch between the pace of technology and the pace of law-making. Technology evolves exponentially; law typically moves linearly, sometimes even glacially. This creates a perpetual "regulatory lag" where new business models, digital assets, or AI applications emerge long before our legal frameworks can adequately address them. For instance, while we now have the PDP Law, the nuances of data ownership in AI models or the legal standing of decentralized autonomous organizations (DAOs) are still largely unaddressed. This uncertainty can either stifle legitimate innovation due to fear of legal ambiguity or, worse, lead to unchecked exploitation due to a lack of clear rules. From my perspective, merely adding new regulations for every new tech phenomenon isn't the sustainable answer. This approach often leads to over-regulation or fragmented, inconsistent rules. Instead, we need a fundamental shift in how we approach business law in the digital era.

Here are my key thoughts on the way forward: First, we must champion agile regulation. This isn't just a buzzword; it's a necessity. It involves approaches like regulatory sandboxes, which allow innovations to be tested in a controlled environment. This not only gives innovators room to experiment but also provides regulators invaluable real-world data to understand the technology before crafting definitive rules. The Financial Services Authority (OJK) has done a good job with fintech sandboxes, but this model needs to be expanded across other sectors experiencing disruption, such as logistics, healthcare, and education technology. Second, capacity building is non-negotiable. Our judges, prosecutors, lawyers, and especially regulators, need continuous, deep immersion in emerging technologies. It's not enough to know *about* AI; they need to understand *how* it works, its underlying principles, and its potential societal impacts. This requires cross-disciplinary training, partnerships with tech companies, and perhaps even dedicated tech-law units within governmental bodies. Without this understanding, enforcement becomes arbitrary, and policy decisions lack foresight. Third, collaboration with multi-stakeholders is paramount.

Lawmaking in the digital age cannot be a top-down, isolated process. Regulators must actively engage with innovators, academics, industry associations, and civil society. This ensures that new regulations are well-informed, practical, and balance various interests. It fosters a sense of shared responsibility and builds trust between the government and the innovative ecosystem.

Finally, we must embed ethical considerations and principles of sustainability into the heart of our business law. The rapid pace of technology can sometimes obscure its broader societal implications. Our legal frameworks must ensure that innovation serves the public good, respects privacy, avoids algorithmic bias, and contributes to a more sustainable and equitable economy. It's about designing laws that encourage "responsible innovation." In essence, Indonesia's challenge in this regulatory dilemma is to cultivate a legal system that is not just a gatekeeper but also a facilitator. A system that understands technology's potential, anticipates its challenges, and crafts adaptable rules that encourage responsible growth. This will require courage, foresight, and a willingness to embrace new ways of thinking about law in the 21st century.

CONCLUSION

This study found that in the context of business law in Indonesia, existing regulations tend to be slow to respond to disruptive technological innovation, creating tension between the need to maintain legal certainty and the drive for dynamic innovation. For example, fintech and e-commerce regulations still face challenges in accommodating new digital-based business models, while bureaucratic legislative processes slow down legal adaptation to technological developments. These findings underscore the need for a more adaptive and participatory regulatory approach to bridge the gap between legal oversight and the development of business innovation in the digital era. Although Indonesia has undertaken various regulatory adaptation efforts, delays in regulatory updates remain, significantly impacting innovation development. Weaknesses in consumer protection, competition issues, and unclear cross-border jurisdictions exacerbate the legal uncertainty facing businesses. These conditions not only hinder the optimal entry of new innovations but also create high legal risks for businesses, thereby reducing the attractiveness of investment and growth in the country's technology sector. In Indonesia, despite adaptation efforts, regulatory lag, consumer protection, competition issues, and cross-border jurisdiction remain significant challenges. Based on the research results, effective solutions to address these problems include implementing a more agile regulatory approach, increasing human resource capacity, strengthening data protection, fostering multi-stakeholder collaboration, and promoting harmonization of international law. Solutions include adopting a more agile regulatory approach, enhancing human resource capacity, strengthening data protection, fostering multi-stakeholder collaboration, and promoting harmonization of international law. However, implementing these recommendations faces various challenges, including institutional inertia, competing political and economic interests, and capacity gaps between institutions. Therefore, critical engagement with potential trade-offs in policy formulation and implementation is crucial to ensure legal reform efforts are not merely normative but also contextual and sustainable. By doing so, business law can function as a facilitator of responsible innovation, creating a conducive environment for sustainable economic growth and protecting public interests in the digital era. Indonesia's ability to address technological disruption in business law depends not only on sound legislative drafting but also on building a responsive legal ecosystem. This ecosystem must be supported by adaptive regulations, inter-institutional collaboration, digital infrastructure, and inclusive policies. We need to shift from laws that simply follow innovation to laws that enable responsible innovation. We must shift from a legal paradigm that simply follows innovation to a legal framework that actively allows innovation to thrive responsibly. In Indonesia, for example, the lack of adequate regulation of online lending services (fintech lending) during their early days led to rampant debt collection practices that violated users' privacy rights and sparked social unrest. However, with the issuance of OJK Regulation No. 10/POJK.05/2022 concerning Information Technology-Based Collaborative Funding Services, the country has begun to demonstrate how the law can be an instrument that guides innovation along an ethical and safe path. This example demonstrates that the role of law is not merely to respond to change, but to act as an architect, responsibly shaping the innovation ecosystem.

REFERENCES

Arner, D. W., Buckley, R. P., Zetzsche, D. A., & Veidt, L. (2020). No Title. *Artificial Intelligence and FinTech: Towards a Regulatory Synthesis*, *25*(1), 221–279.

Arrizal, N. Z., Kharisma, B. U., & Nur, A. I. (2021). No Title. *Juridical Review of Job Creation Law in Indonesia Perspective of Corporation Law Body*, *1*(2).

Baiquni, M. I., & Waspiah, W. (2023). *Two decades of business competition law: How has Indonesian competition law transformed*. *7*(1).

Baldwin, R., Cave, M., & Lodge, M. (2012). *Understanding Regulation: Theory, Strategy and Practice*. Oxford University Press.

Bamberger, K. A., & Lobel, O. (2017). *Platform market power*. *7*(1), 1–25.

Bank, W. (2020). *Doing Business 2020: Comparing Business Regulation in 190 Economies. World Bank Publications.*

Black, J. (2008). *Forms and Functions of Regulation*. 2008–2013.

Brownsword, R. (2017). *Regulating Code: Good, Bad, Ugly, and Illegal*. *1*(1), 1–28.

Buckley, R. P., Arner, D. W., & Zetzsche, D. A. (2016). *The FinTech Revolution: A Regulators' Roundtable*. *1*(1), 1–22.

Butt, S. (2020). *Indonesian business law and legal reform*. *15*(1), 1–25.

Clack, C. D., Bakshi, V. A., & Braine, L. (2016). *Smart contract templates: Foundations, design landscape and research directions.*

De Filippi, P., & Hassan, S. (2018). *Blockchain technology as a regulatory technology: From code is law to law is code*. *21*(12).

Fenwick, M., Kaal, W. A., & Vermeulen, E. P. (2019). *Regulation tomorrow: What happens when technology is faster than the law? 8*(3), 561–594.

Floridi, L., Cowls, J., Beltrametti, M., Chatila, R., Chazerand, P., Dignum, V., ... & Vayena, E. (2018). *AI4People—Ethical Framework for a Good AI Society: Opportunities, Risks, Principles, and Recommendation*. *28*(4), 689–707.

Gunawan, J. (2020). *Validity of electronic contracts in civil law perspective*. *5*(2), 102–117.

Gürkaynak, G., Yilmaz, O., & Yenidogan, E. (2018). *Regulatory Dilemmas in Digital Markets: Balancing Innovation and Competition*. *14*(2), 241–267.

Haliwela, N. S., & Chansrakaeo, R. (2024). *The Corporate Social Responsibility Regulation in the Development of Business Law: Comparison of Indonesia and Thailand*. *8*(1).

Hawin, M., Butt, S., & Setianingrum, R. B. (2023). *Evaluating Whether Indonesia Should Maintain or Revise Its Local Incorporation Requirement for Foreign Investors*. *31*(2).

Indonesia, B. (2020). *Peraturan Bank Indonesia Nomor 22/23/PBI/2020 tentang Sistem Pembayaran*.

Iramani, R. R., Mongid, A., & Muazaroh, M. (2021). *Reform of the Limited Liability Company Law for the Enforcement of Good Corporate Governance*.

Khan, L. M. (2017). *Amazon's Antitrust Paradox*. *126*(3), 710–802.

Koops, B. J., Leenes, R., & van der Sloot, B. (2017). *Data Protection and Privacy: The Age of Intelligent Machines*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Kusuma, D., & Rachmawati, T. (2020). *Regulatory sandbox as an adaptation instrument for fintech*. *9*(1), 75–89.

Martiniasih, N., & Saravistha, D. B. (2021). *Harmonization of BI and OJK regulatory sandbox authority*. *3*(8), 1–12.

Marzuki, P. M. (2021). *Penelitian Hukum (Edisi Revisi)*. Kencana.

Nazir, M. (2014). *Metode Penelitian*. Ghalia Indonesia.

Nonet, P., & Selznick, P. (2001). *Law and Society in Transition: Toward Responsive Law*. Transaction Publishers.

OECD. (2021). *The Digital Transformation of SMEs*. OECD Publishing.

Oktaviandra, S. (2024). *Closing Legal Loopholes on Indonesia Investment Law in Digital Age*. *15*(1).

Partners, C. &. (2024). Fintech laws & regulations 2024. *Chambers Global*.

Peraturan Otoritas Jasa Keuangan Nomor 13/POJK.02/2018 Tentang Inovasi Keuangan Digital Di Sektor Jasa Keuanga (2020).

Priestley, J. M., & Susanti, R. (2023). *The Urgency of Legal Reform in Enhancing Digital Forensics Capacity for Cybercrime Eradication in Indonesia*. *53*(1), 127–147.

Rachmania, S. N., Sukarmi, & Hadiyantina, S. (2025). *Legal analysis of the ratio legis behind risk based business licensing reform in Indonesia: A study of PP No. 24/2018 and PP No. 5/2021*. *96*(1), 140–149.

Ramadhani, N., Nandani, D. R., Arrizki, F., & N. (2023). Peran Digitalisasi Teknologi Informasi Dalam Proses Pengembembangan E-Commerce di Era 4.0 dan Society 5.0. *Jurnal Ekonomi Syariah*, 225–232.

Rohaya, N., Sinulingga, D. B., & Mutiara, U. (2023). *Challenges of Indonesian Contract Law in the Digital Business Era*.

Schwab, K. (2017). *The Fourth Industrial Revolution*.

Setiadi, E. (2021). *Challenges in Regulating Fintech in Indonesia: A Legal Perspective*. *3*(1), 45–59.

Setiadi, E., & Sari, V. R. (2022). *Legal Protection of Personal Data in Digital Transactions in Indonesia*. *25*(S2), 1–10.

Sugeng, S., Tobing, C. I., & Fajarwati, R. (2020). *Indonesian Fintech: Business Ecosystem and Regulation*. *5*(2), 277–295.

Sunstein, C. R. (2013). *Simpler: The Future of Government*.

Susilo, B., & Hidayat, M. (2021). *The Legal Challenges of Cross-Border E-Commerce Disputes in Indonesia*. *13*(1), 1–12.

Syahrina, M. A. (2020). *Validity concept of electronic contracts under national law & UNCITRAL*. *9*(2), 105–120.

Tapscott, D., & Tapscott, A. (2016). Blockchain Revolution: How the Technology Behind Bitcoin Is Changing Money, Business, and the World. In *Portfolio*.

Tisnadibrata, Y. (2021). *Law enforcement in digital ecosystems*. *51*(4), 311–330.

UNCITRAL. (2017). *Model Law on Electronic Transferable Records*.

Utomo, B., & Rahayu, R. M. (2023). *The Urgency of Regulatory Framework to Protect Consumers in Digital Financial Services*. *23*(1), 1–12.

Vollmer, J. (2022). *Governing the Digital Economy: Regulatory Responses to the Rise of Big Tech*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Wirtz, B. W., & Müller, W. M. (2019). *An integrated AI framework for public management*. *21*(7), 1076–1100.

Yudhistira, M. H., & Wicaksono, A. T. (2022). *Legal Readiness for Digital Innovation: The Case of Indonesia's Tech Ecosystem*. *39*(2), 201–221.

Zetzsche, D. A., Buckley, R. P., Arner, D. W., & Barberis, J. N. (2017). *Regulating a Revolution: From Regulatory Sandboxes to Smart Regulation*. *23*(1), 31–103.