# Governing Public–Private Artificial Intelligence Partnerships: Balancing Public Value and Commercial Interests in the Digital State

**George Samermit**
Southeast Asia University, Thailand
E-mail: pianghathaik@gmail.com

**Sasawat Pengpae**
Southeast Asia University, Thailand
E-mail: pianghathaik@gmail.com

**Patcharaporn Rattanawaropas**
Southeast Asia University, Thailand
E-mail: pianghathaik@gmail.com

**Ubon Pun-ubon**
Southeast Asia University, Thailand
E-mail: pianghathaik@gmail.com

| Received: May 04, 2026 | Revised: May 23, 2026 | Accepted: June 01, 2026 |
|---|---|---|

**Abstract**
This study examines the governance of Public–Private Partnerships (PPPs) in Artificial Intelligence (AI) within the context of the digital state. As governments increasingly rely on AI-driven systems for public service delivery, risk assessment, and administrative decision-making, collaboration with private technology firms has moved beyond conventional outsourcing arrangements into the core architecture of public authority. Unlike traditional PPPs focused on infrastructure or service provision, AI-enabled partnerships embed private actors within algorithmic decision infrastructures that directly shape public outcomes. Drawing on qualitative policy analysis and documentary research, this study integrates PPP governance, algorithmic governance, and public value theory. The findings demonstrate that AI-driven partnerships reconfigure PPPs from contractual risk allocation toward the co-production of algorithmic authority. Data asymmetry, technical opacity, and commercial incentives generate structural tensions between market efficiency and the preservation of public value, including transparency, accountability, equity, and legitimacy. The study proposes an integrated governance framework encompassing four dimensions: contract governance, data governance, algorithmic transparency and auditability, and public value accountability. By conceptualizing Public–Private AI Partnerships as a form of co-production of algorithmic authority, this research extends PPP theory into the domain of digital governance and highlights the institutional conditions necessary to sustain democratic legitimacy in AI-enabled public administration.
**Keywords:** Public–Private Partnerships, Artificial Intelligence Governance, Digital State, Algorithmic Authority, Public Value, Data Governance

## Introduction

Over the past decade, Artificial Intelligence (AI) has become an increasingly central component of public administration in many countries, particularly within the context of the digital state, where large-scale data integration, automated systems, and digital infrastructures are embedded into policy decision-making processes and public service delivery (Dunleavy et al., 2006; Margetts & Dorobantu, 2019).

The application of AI in the public sector now extends across a wide range of governmental functions, including fraud detection, eligibility screening for public benefits, public health risk assessment, budget management, and the prediction of citizens' social behavior. In this evolving governance landscape, algorithmic systems no longer serve merely as decision-support tools; rather, they increasingly shape the logic, conditions, and outcomes of administrative decision-making.

Under these circumstances, the transition toward the digital state cannot be achieved solely through the internal capabilities of government institutions. Instead, it relies heavily on collaboration with private technology firms, particularly those specializing in cloud computing, data infrastructure, and machine learning model development. Such collaborations are commonly structured through Public–Private Partnerships (PPPs), which historically focused on the provision of infrastructure or public services (Hodge & Greve, 2007).


**Citation:** Samermit, G., Pengpae, S., Rattanawarapas, P., & Pun-ubon, U. (2026). Governing Public–Private Artificial Intelligence Partnerships: Balancing Public Value and Commercial Interests in the Digital State. International Journal of Development Administration Research, 9 (2), 1-10.

However, in the context of AI, these partnerships extend beyond the traditional role of resource provision toward the co-design of the state's decision-making architecture, thereby influencing citizens' rights, obligations, and access to public resources in practice.

This structural transformation suggests that Public–Private AI partnerships cannot be adequately analyzed through traditional PPP frameworks alone. In algorithmic systems, private actors do not simply deliver services; they actively participate in defining classification thresholds, selecting training datasets, and calibrating model parameters. These design choices inevitably embed specific assumptions, values, and priorities into the system itself (Kitchin, 2017; Yeung, 2018). Consequently, administrative authority becomes technically embedded within data structures and code, rather than solely expressed through formal administrative decisions.

At the same time, literature on algorithmic governance highlights significant risks associated with the opacity and "black box" characteristics of many algorithmic systems. Such opacity may undermine the public's ability to scrutinize and challenge governmental decisions (Pasquale, 2015). In contrast, Public Value Theory emphasizes that public administration must be grounded in legitimacy, transparency, accountability, and equity (Moore, 1995; Bryson et al., 2014). When AI systems used in governance are developed and controlled by private firms driven by commercial incentives, tensions between market logic and public value become increasingly pronounced.

Although the PPP literature has traditionally focused on risk allocation and contractual incentives, and the algorithmic governance literature has examined ethical concerns and transparency issues, a significant theoretical gap remains. Existing studies rarely provide an integrated analytical framework that simultaneously addresses the institutional relationship between governments and AI developers, the emergence of algorithmic authority, and the normative foundations of public value. This gap becomes particularly critical when private actors participate directly in designing decision-making infrastructures that affect citizens' rights and policy outcomes.

In the context of Thailand, the advancement of digital government initiatives, the expansion of public data infrastructures, and the increasing use of AI in policy decision-making have intensified the role of external technology firms in public governance. Consequently, governance challenges extend beyond questions of efficiency or cost-effectiveness to encompass broader issues such as system transparency, personal data protection, bargaining power asymmetry, and democratic oversight mechanisms.

In response to these developments, this study examines Public–Private AI partnerships as a process of "co-production of algorithmic authority." Using qualitative research methods, including documentary analysis and theoretical synthesis, the study aims to explain the structural transformation of PPPs in the context of the digital state and to develop an integrated conceptual framework linking PPP governance, algorithmic governance, and public value theory. Through this framework, the research seeks to provide policy-relevant insights into how governance mechanisms can preserve transparency, accountability, and democratic legitimacy in AI-enabled public administration.

This study contributes to the literature by reconceptualizing Public–Private AI partnerships as a form of algorithmic power co-production and proposing an integrated governance framework suitable for the digital state.

**Research Objectives**

This study aims to examine the governance of Public–Private Artificial Intelligence (AI) partnerships in the context of the digital state. Specifically, the study pursues the following objectives:

**1.** To analyze the structural and power transformations of Public–Private Partnerships (PPPs) in the context of AI adoption in the public sector, in comparison with traditional PPP frameworks.

2. To examine governance tensions arising from the interaction between commercial incentives of private technology firms and public value principles, particularly regarding transparency, accountability, and equity in governmental decision-making processes.

3. To develop an integrated conceptual framework for governing Public–Private AI partnerships, capable of explaining and addressing power-related risks within digital state governance.



**Citation:** Samermit, G., Pengpae, S., Rattanawarapas, P., & Pun-ubon, U. (2026). Governing Public–Private Artificial Intelligence Partnerships: Balancing Public Value and Commercial Interests in the Digital State. International Journal of Development Administration Research, 9 (2), 1-10.

## Scope of the Study

Research Design

This study employs a qualitative research approach, utilizing qualitative policy analysis, documentary analysis, and theoretical synthesis to examine the governance of Public–Private Artificial Intelligence (AI) partnerships within the context of the digital state.

Rather than testing statistical hypotheses or measuring quantitative relationships, the research focuses on interpretive institutional analysis to understand the underlying structures of power, governance mechanisms, and the dynamics of interaction between government institutions and private technology firms involved in the development and deployment of algorithmic systems.

The analytical process is conducted through thematic categorization, based on the conceptual framework developed in this study. The analysis is organized around four principal dimensions: contract governance, data governance, algorithmic governance, and public value governance. These dimensions are subsequently synthesized and compared with the existing literature on PPP governance, algorithmic governance, and public value theory to develop a coherent conceptual model with strong internal logic and analytical clarity.

To strengthen the credibility of the analysis, the study applies cross-literature consistency checks and systematically explains the theoretical synthesis process in accordance with contemporary standards for conceptual research in public administration.

## Scope of Content

This study focuses its analysis on the following key dimensions:

1. Public–Private collaborations involving the development, design, or implementation of artificial intelligence systems that influence administrative decision-making or policy outcomes, particularly in cases where algorithmic systems play a role in determining citizens' rights, allocating public resources, or assessing risks affecting individuals or groups.

2. Institutional, legal, and policy governance mechanisms related to AI deployment in the public sector. The study does not examine the technical performance of AI models or the engineering details of algorithmic systems.

3. Governance risks associated with the use of AI in public administration, including algorithmic opacity, algorithmic bias, information asymmetry, and power imbalances between government institutions and private technology providers.

By defining the scope in this manner, the study emphasizes institutional and structural analysis of governance arrangements, rather than technical evaluation of AI technologies.

## Geographical and Contextual Scope

The analysis primarily focuses on Thailand as a conceptual focal case, examining the expansion of digital government policies and the increasing reliance on data-driven systems in public administration. The Thai context provides a relevant setting for exploring how Public–Private AI partnerships evolve within emerging digital governance structures.

To enhance theoretical relevance and international applicability, the study also draws conceptual comparisons with global governance frameworks, including the OECD Principles on Artificial Intelligence (2019) and regulatory approaches reflected in the European Union AI Act. These comparisons are not intended as detailed legal analyses but rather serve to clarify governance gaps and strengthen the theoretical discussion.

## Temporal Scope

The study focuses on the period from approximately 2018 onwards, which corresponds with the accelerated development of Thailand's digital government policies and the growing adoption of AI technologies within public sector governance.

This timeframe captures a critical phase in which AI-driven decision systems have begun to significantly influence public administration, making it possible to analyze the structural transformation of governance in the digital state.



**Citation:** Samermit, G., Pengpae, S., Rattanawarapas, P., & Pun-ubon, U. (2026). Governing Public–Private Artificial Intelligence Partnerships: Balancing Public Value and Commercial Interests in the Digital State. International Journal of Development Administration Research, 9 (2), 1-10.

## Methodology

This study employs a qualitative research design with a theoretical and policy-oriented orientation. The research applies qualitative policy analysis, combined with documentary analysis and theoretical synthesis, to examine governance arrangements for Public–Private Artificial Intelligence (AI) partnerships within the context of the digital state.

Rather than testing statistical hypotheses or measuring causal relationships through quantitative methods, the study focuses on interpretive institutional analysis. This approach aims to understand the underlying structures of power, governance mechanisms, and the institutional dynamics shaping the interaction between public sector institutions and private technology firms involved in the development and deployment of algorithmic systems.

The analysis is guided by the integrated conceptual framework developed in this study, which synthesizes insights from PPP governance, algorithmic governance, and public value theory. This framework provides the analytical lens for examining the structural transformation of Public–Private Partnerships in the era of digital governance.

### Data Sources and Document Selection

The primary sources of data consist of academic literature and policy-related documents that are publicly accessible and widely recognized in scholarly research. Documents were selected through purposive sampling, based on the following criteria:

1. Direct relevance to key themes of Public–Private Partnerships, governance networks, accountability, algorithmic regulation, and public value.
2. Recognition within international academic literature or policy frameworks related to digital governance and AI governance.
3. Relevance to contemporary debates concerning the governance of AI systems and the digital transformation of the public sector.

These sources include scholarly journal articles, policy reports, theoretical works in public administration, and international governance frameworks addressing the regulation and governance of artificial intelligence.

### Data Analysis

Data analysis was conducted using thematic analysis, in which the selected documents were categorized according to the four core dimensions of the conceptual framework developed in this research:

1. Contract and incentive governance
2. Data governance and control over information resources
3. Algorithmic transparency and auditability
4. Public value and accountability governance

Following thematic categorization, the study conducted a comparative analytical synthesis across the three major theoretical traditions—PPP governance, algorithmic governance, and public value theory. This process aimed to identify conceptual gaps and structural inconsistencies in traditional PPP governance frameworks when applied to algorithmic decision-making systems.

The analysis, therefore, seeks to answer a central analytical question: what aspects of AI-enabled governance are not adequately addressed by existing PPP governance frameworks, and how governance mechanisms must evolve to address emerging power risks in the digital state.

### Analytical Rigor and Conceptual Validity

To enhance the robustness and credibility of the findings, the study applies triangulation across theoretical traditions, comparing insights derived from multiple strands of literature, including PPP governance, algorithmic governance, and public value theory. This approach reduces the risk of analytical bias associated with reliance on a single theoretical perspective.

Furthermore, the study explicitly documents the process of theoretical synthesis and the logical development of the conceptual framework. By maintaining transparency in the analytical procedure, the research ensures that readers can clearly trace the reasoning process and assess the internal coherence of the proposed governance framework.

## Research Findings

The analysis of the selected literature and policy documents reveals four major thematic findings. These findings indicate that Public–Private Artificial Intelligence (AI) partnerships are not merely



**Citation:** Samermit, G., Pengpae, S., Rattanawarapas, P., & Pun-ubon, U. (2026). Governing Public–Private Artificial Intelligence Partnerships: Balancing Public Value and Commercial Interests in the Digital State. International Journal of Development Administration Research, 9 (2), 1-10.

technological collaborations but represent a significant transformation in the structural power relations underlying Public–Private Partnerships (PPPs) within the digital state.

**Finding 1: The Expansion of PPPs into the Core of State Decision-Making**

Existing literature on digital governance and algorithmic governance consistently indicates that AI systems do not merely support decision-making processes; rather, they shape the decision architecture of the state through the design of datasets, classification thresholds, and computational logic (Dunleavy et al., 2006; Margetts & Dorobantu, 2019; Yeung, 2018).

As Public–Private collaborations extend into these algorithmic infrastructures, the role of private actors shifts from that of service providers to co-designers of policy logic. Administrative authority is no longer expressed solely through formal governmental decisions or bureaucratic discretion; instead, it becomes embedded within data structures and algorithmic models that private firms help design or control (Pasquale, 2015).

This finding demonstrates that the nature of PPPs has evolved from traditional resource allocation mechanisms toward the co-production of algorithmic authority, fundamentally reshaping the structure of state power in the digital era.

**Finding 2: Data and Expertise Asymmetry Strengthens the Bargaining Power of Private Actors**

The PPP literature has long recognized information asymmetry as a structural challenge in long-term public–private collaborations (Hodge & Greve, 2007). However, in the context of AI governance, this asymmetry becomes significantly amplified.

Within AI systems, data resources, algorithmic models, and specialized technical expertise constitute critical sources of power. Governments frequently depend on private technology firms that possess advanced data analytics capabilities and proprietary technologies (Kitchin, 2017).

As a result, control over data and intellectual property may substantially increase the bargaining power of private firms and create risks of vendor lock-in, in which governments become structurally dependent on specific technology providers.

This finding suggests that contract-based governance mechanisms alone are insufficient to address structural power imbalances in AI partnerships. Effective governance must therefore extend beyond contractual risk allocation to include stronger mechanisms of data governance and technological oversight.

**Finding 3: The "Black Box" Problem Undermines Traditional Accountability Mechanisms**

The literature on algorithmic governance highlights that many algorithmic systems function as **"black boxes"**, meaning that their internal decision-making processes are difficult for external actors to understand or scrutinize (Pasquale, 2015; Yeung, 2018).

When public sector decision-making increasingly relies on opaque algorithmic models, traditional accountability mechanisms—such as procedural audits or administrative review processes—may become inadequate (Bovens, 2007).

The absence of explainability and auditability in algorithmic decision-making systems does not merely represent a technical limitation; it directly affects democratic governance. Citizens may find it difficult to understand, challenge, or appeal decisions that significantly affect their rights and access to public resources.

This finding, therefore, indicates that PPP governance frameworks in the AI era must expand beyond monitoring contractual performance to include algorithmic transparency and independent auditing mechanisms.

**Finding 4: Structural Tension Between Commercial Logic and Public Value**

Public Value Theory emphasizes that public governance must uphold principles such as transparency, fairness, accountability, and social trust (Moore, 1995; Bryson et al., 2014). However, Public–Private AI collaborations frequently operate under strong **commercial incentives**, including profit generation, data accumulation, and technological market advantage.

Empirical studies illustrate how algorithmic systems may unintentionally reinforce social inequalities. For instance, Eubanks (2018) demonstrates how automated welfare management systems can disproportionately affect vulnerable populations, while Zuboff (2019) describes the emergence of surveillance capitalism, in which large technology companies accumulate extensive data resources to strengthen their commercial dominance.



**Citation:** Samermit, G., Pengpae, S., Rattanawarapas, P., & Pun-ubon, U. (2026). Governing Public–Private Artificial Intelligence Partnerships: Balancing Public Value and Commercial Interests in the Digital State. International Journal of Development Administration Research, 9 (2), 1-10.

The analysis, therefore, reveals that the tension between commercial logic and public value is not simply a policy-level disagreement but a structural tension embedded within the design and governance of algorithmic systems. Without appropriate governance mechanisms, such tensions may undermine both social equity and the democratic legitimacy of public institutions.

**Summary of Findings**

Taken together, these four findings indicate that Public–Private AI partnerships fundamentally transform the nature of PPP governance. Rather than functioning solely as contractual arrangements for service delivery, AI partnerships create structural power relationships embedded within data infrastructures and algorithmic systems.

Consequently, effective governance must move beyond traditional contract governance toward a more comprehensive framework integrating data governance, algorithmic governance, and public value governance. Only through such integrated governance mechanisms can governments effectively manage emerging power risks while preserving transparency, accountability, and democratic legitimacy in the digital state.

Table 1: **Summary of Findings**

| Theme | Key Issue | Governance Risk |
|---|---|---|
| AI in decision architecture | Private role expansion | Algorithmic authority |
| Data asymmetry | Technical dependency | Vendor lock-in |
| Black box systems | Lack of explainability | Accountability gap |
| Commercial logic | Profit-driven AI | Public value tension |

**Discussion**

The findings of this study reveal that the structural challenge of Public–Private Artificial Intelligence (AI) partnerships does not primarily lie in issues of efficiency or cost-effectiveness. Rather, the core issue concerns the transformation of Public–Private Partnerships (PPPs) from traditional service delivery arrangements into collaborative structures that shape the decision-making architecture of the state.

This transformation fundamentally shifts the locus of governance power from contractual agreements to algorithmic infrastructures, which determine classification rules, data processing logics, and policy outcomes in practice. In this context, algorithmic systems function not merely as technological tools but as institutional mechanisms through which administrative authority is operationalized.

Within contemporary public administration scholarship, this development raises two critical questions.

First, how can governments maintain legitimacy and accountability when policy decisions are increasingly embedded within complex and opaque technological systems (Bovens, 2007; Pasquale, 2015)?

Second, how should governments structure market-based collaborations with private actors in ways that continue to generate public value rather than simply pursuing economic efficiency or cost reduction (Moore, 1995; Bryson et al., 2014)?

Compared with traditional PPP arrangements—where governance concerns primarily involve financial and operational risk allocation—this study suggests that the central risk in the digital state is power asymmetry risk. This form of risk emerges from several interrelated factors, including private control over data resources, the opacity of algorithmic models, and the growing technical dependency of governments on specialized technology providers.

These risks carry long-term institutional implications. When governments rely heavily on proprietary technologies and privately controlled data infrastructures, their ability to independently shape policy directions may gradually erode. In such circumstances, governments may retain formal authority within legal frameworks while losing operational authority within technological infrastructures, which increasingly determine how public decisions are implemented in practice (Hodge & Greve, 2007; Kitchin, 2017).

Consequently, effective governance in the digital state cannot be achieved solely through improvements in contractual arrangements or stronger legal enforcement mechanisms. Instead,



**Citation:** Samermit, G., Pengpae, S., Rattanawarapas, P., & Pun-ubon, U. (2026). Governing Public–Private Artificial Intelligence Partnerships: Balancing Public Value and Commercial Interests in the Digital State. International Journal of Development Administration Research, 9 (2), 1-10.

governance must evolve toward an integrated governance approach that simultaneously addresses four interconnected dimensions:

1. Contract governance, which must extend beyond traditional procurement oversight to include provisions concerning data access, model transparency, and system interoperability.

2. Data governance, which must ensure that governments maintain control over critical data infrastructures and avoid structural dependency on private data monopolies.

3. Algorithmic governance, which must promote transparency, explainability, and independent auditing of algorithmic systems.

Public value governance, which must ensure that algorithmic decision-making processes remain consistent with democratic principles such as accountability, equity, and public trust.

These four dimensions should not operate as isolated governance mechanisms. Instead, they must function as a coherent institutional framework, recognizing that power embedded within algorithmic systems is inherently interconnected across technological, economic, and normative domains.

This argument aligns with emerging international discussions on AI governance, including the OECD AI Principles (2019) and scholarly work on algorithmic regulation (Yeung, 2018). However, the present study extends these discussions by emphasizing the institutional dimension of Public–Private AI partnerships, highlighting how the co-development of algorithmic infrastructures reshapes the distribution of power between public institutions and private technology firms.

In this regard, the concept of "co-production of algorithmic authority" proposed in this study provides an analytical lens for understanding the evolving nature of governance in the digital state. Rather than viewing AI partnerships as purely technological collaborations, this perspective recognizes them as institutional arrangements through which public authority is partially embedded within privately developed technological systems.

Ultimately, the governance challenge of the digital state lies not only in adopting advanced technologies but also in designing governance architectures capable of regulating algorithmic power in ways that preserve transparency, accountability, and democratic legitimacy. Without such governance mechanisms, the accumulation of algorithmic power within market-driven infrastructures may gradually undermine public trust and weaken the normative foundations of democratic governance.

## Conclusion

This study set out to examine the governance of Public–Private Artificial Intelligence (AI) partnerships within the context of the digital state, with particular attention to how algorithmic systems reshape the distribution of power between governments and private technology firms. The findings indicate that AI-enabled collaborations cannot be adequately understood as conventional procurement arrangements or outsourcing mechanisms. Instead, they represent a structural transformation in which public and private actors jointly construct the technological infrastructures that shape public decision-making.

From this perspective, Public–Private AI partnerships constitute a process of co-production of algorithmic authority, in which algorithmic systems become embedded within administrative decision-making processes. Through the design of datasets, classification rules, and computational models, these systems directly influence policy outcomes, the allocation of public resources, and citizens' access to public services.

The study contributes to the literature in three important ways.

First, it extends traditional PPP theory by shifting analytical attention from contractual arrangements and financial risk allocation toward the power embedded in data infrastructures and algorithmic architectures, which cannot be effectively governed through contractual mechanisms alone.

Second, the study bridges the literature on algorithmic governance and public administration, highlighting that transparency and accountability in the AI era must extend beyond policy principles to include the technical architecture of decision-making systems.

Third, by integrating Public Value Theory into the analysis of market-based technological collaborations, the study demonstrates that the legitimacy of the digital state depends not solely on technological efficiency but also on the ability of governments to maintain transparency, fairness, and public trust in algorithmic governance systems.



**Citation:** Samermit, G., Pengpae, S., Rattanawarapas, P., & Pun-ubon, U. (2026). Governing Public–Private Artificial Intelligence Partnerships: Balancing Public Value and Commercial Interests in the Digital State. International Journal of Development Administration Research, 9 (2), 1-10.

From a policy perspective, the findings suggest that the governance of Public–Private AI partnerships must evolve toward an integrated governance framework that simultaneously addresses four interrelated dimensions:

1. Contract governance, ensuring that contractual arrangements regulate not only system delivery but also data access and algorithmic oversight.

2. Data governance, safeguarding public data sovereignty, and preventing structural dependency on private data infrastructures.

3. Algorithmic governance, promoting transparency, explainability, and independent auditing of AI systems used in public decision-making.

4. Public value governance, ensuring that algorithmic systems operate within democratic principles of accountability, fairness, and public oversight.

These governance dimensions must function as a coherent institutional system rather than isolated regulatory mechanisms. Addressing only one dimension—such as contractual arrangements or data regulation—will not be sufficient to manage the structural power risks associated with AI-enabled governance.

Ultimately, the transition toward the digital state is not simply a matter of technological adoption. It requires the development of governance architectures capable of regulating algorithmic power within the broader political economy of data and technological markets. Recognizing Public–Private AI partnerships as institutional spaces where algorithmic authority is co-produced provides a critical step toward ensuring that digital governance systems remain consistent with democratic values and capable of generating sustainable public value in the long term.

Table 2 Integrated Governance Framework for Public–Private AI Partnerships in the Digital State

| Governance Dimension | Structural Issues | Key Power Risks | Proposed Governance Mechanisms |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Contract Governance** | Risk allocation, AI system development, delivery conditions, and intellectual property arrangements | Vendor lock-in, technical dependency, loss of policy direction, and control | AI-specific contractual standards, minimum technical disclosure requirements, interoperability clauses |
| **Data Governance** | Data ownership, access rights, reuse, and data mobility | Data monopolization, power asymmetry from data control, loss of data sovereignty | Government data ownership rights, public data standards, and data portability requirements |
| **Algorithmic Governance** | Model transparency, explainability, and system auditability | Black-box decision-making, algorithmic bias, weakened accountability. | Independent algorithmic auditing, risk-based AI classification, and explainability requirements |
| **Public Value Governance** | Equity, accountability, legitimacy, and public trust | Algorithmic inequality, decline in public trust, erosion of citizen rights | Complaint and appeal mechanisms, human oversight, stakeholder |



**Citation:** Samermit, G., Pengpae, S., Rattanawarapas, P., & Pun-ubon, U. (2026). Governing Public–Private Artificial Intelligence Partnerships: Balancing Public Value and Commercial Interests in the Digital State. International Journal of Development Administration Research, 9 (2), 1-10.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | transparency, and engagement |

**Policy Recommendations**

Based on the findings of this study, several policy and governance recommendations can be proposed to address the power-related risks associated with Public–Private Artificial Intelligence (AI) partnerships in the digital state.

***1. Systemic Design of AI Contracting Frameworks***

Governments should develop **specialized contractual frameworks for AI-related projects** that extend beyond conventional procurement mechanisms. AI contracts should regulate not only system delivery but also policy impacts and governance implications arising from algorithmic decision-making. Such contracts should include provisions concerning:

-Minimum requirements for functional transparency of AI systems

- Government access to data structures and model components necessary for impact assessment

- Interoperability standards and system transfer mechanisms to reduce long-term dependency on specific vendors

Contract governance must therefore evolve from controlling service delivery outcomes toward regulating the structures of algorithmic power embedded in technological systems.

***2. Strengthening Public Data Sovereignty***

Because data constitute the foundation of algorithmic power, governments must establish clear principles regarding public ownership, control, and access to data resources used in AI systems.

Key policy measures may include:

-Explicit contractual provisions defining government ownership and usage rights over public-sector data

-Establishing data portability standards to prevent long-term technological dependency

-Limiting the commercial use of public data in ways that conflict with public interest objectives

Strengthening data governance is therefore essential for maintaining data sovereignty and strategic autonomy in public policy-making.

***3. Risk-Based Algorithmic Oversight***

AI systems that influence citizens' rights, access to public resources, or administrative decision-making should be regulated according to a risk-based governance approach.

High-risk AI systems should be subject to:

-Algorithmic Impact Assessments (AIA) before implementation

-Independent technical audits conducted by qualified experts

-Human oversight mechanisms for decisions with significant implications for citizens' rights

Such regulatory mechanisms can reduce the risks associated with algorithmic opacity and enhance the legitimacy of automated decision-making processes.

***4. Strengthening Accountability and Appeal Mechanisms***

To preserve fairness and democratic legitimacy, governments must establish robust accountability mechanisms for AI-enabled governance systems.

These mechanisms should include:

-Accessible public complaint and grievance channels

-Citizens' rights to obtain explanations regarding algorithmic decisions affecting them

-Formal appeal procedures allowing human review of algorithmic outcomes

These measures are essential for maintaining public trust and protecting vulnerable populations from potential algorithmic biases or errors.

***5. Developing an Integrated Governance Model***

Finally, governance of Public–Private AI partnerships should not be implemented through fragmented regulatory approaches. Instead, governments should develop an integrated governance framework that connects four key dimensions:

-Contract governance

-Data governance

-Algorithmic governance



**Citation:** Samermit, G., Pengpae, S., Rattanawarapas, P., & Pun-ubon, U. (2026). Governing Public–Private Artificial Intelligence Partnerships: Balancing Public Value and Commercial Interests in the Digital State. International Journal of Development Administration Research, 9 (2), 1-10.

-Public value governance

Integrating these dimensions enables governments to manage the structural power risks associated with algorithmic governance while preserving transparency, accountability, and democratic legitimacy within the digital state.

**References**


Bovens, M. (2007). Analysing and assessing accountability: A conceptual framework. *European Law Journal, 13*(4), 447–468. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0386.2007.00378.x

Bryson, J. M., Crosby, B. C., & Bloomberg, L. L. (2014). Public value governance: Moving beyond traditional public administration and the New Public Management. *Public Administration Review, 74*(4), 445–456. https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12238

Dunleavy, P., Margetts, H., Bastow, S., & Tinkler, J. (2006). New public management is dead—Long live digital-era governance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 16*(3), 467–494. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mui057

Eubanks, V. (2018). *Automating inequality: How high-tech tools profile, police, and punish the poor*. St. Martin's Press.

Hodge, G. A., & Greve, C. (2007). Public–private partnerships: An international performance review. *Public Administration Review, 67*(3), 545–558. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2007.00736.x

Hood, C. (1991). A public management for all seasons? *Public Administration, 69*(1), 3–19. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9299.1991.tb00779.x

Kitchin, R. (2017). Thinking critically about and researching algorithms. *Information, Communication & Society, 20*(1), 14–29. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2016.1154087

Klijn, E.-H., & Teisman, G. R. (2003). Institutional and strategic barriers to public–private partnership: An analysis of Dutch cases. *Public Money & Management, 23*(3), 137–146. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9302.00361

Margetts, H., & Dorobantu, C. (2019). Rethink government with AI. *Nature, 568*(7751), 163–165. https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-019-01099-5

Moore, M. H. (1995). *Creating public value: Strategic management in government*. Harvard University Press.

OECD. (2019). *OECD principles on artificial intelligence*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/eedfee77-en

Pasquale, F. (2015). *The black box society: The secret algorithms that control money and information*. Harvard University Press.

Yeung, K. (2018). Algorithmic regulation: A critical interrogation. *Regulation & Governance, 12*(4), 505–523. https://doi.org/10.1111/rego.12158

Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. PublicAffairs.