

The Urgency of the Personal Data Protection Supervisory Authority (A Comparative Study of Indonesia and South Korea)

Attaniya Almuna¹, Lita Tyesta Addy Listya Wardhani², Sekar Anggun Gading Pinilih³

^{1,2,3}Faculty of Law, Universitas Diponegoro

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 29 Dec 2024

Revised: 14 Feb 2025

Accepted: 26 Feb 2025

ABSTRACT

OBJECTIVES: The purpose of this paper is to identify and analyze the comparison of the regulation of personal data protection supervisory authorities between Indonesia and South Korea and the design of Indonesian personal data protection supervisory authorities to fulfill the adequacy decision based on Indonesia's constitutional system

METHODOLOGY: This research uses a normative juridical approach. The normative juridical approach is legal research, which involves researching literature or secondary data as the basis for conducting research by searching for regulations and literature related to the studied problem.

RESULTS: The National Data Center under the Ministry of Communication and Information Technology assesses the privacy impact to prevent hacking by Ransomware that often happens today by avoiding errors in data processing such as no data backup.²⁵ This authority needs to be adopted in the personal data protection supervisory authority in Indonesia to ensure that there is no violation of the rights of data subjects due to the processing of personal data carried out by institutions or individuals.

CONCLUSION: The design of this personal data protection supervisory authority is expected to be in a single form under the executive and carry out its duties, authority, and functions independently, so it is necessary to reaffirm the independence of the data protection authority in the law. In addition, it is also essential to ratify the Presidential Regulation whose content is related to institutional personnel, recruitment mechanisms, and member dismissal mechanisms.

Keywords: Adequacy Decisions, Personal Data Protection, Authority, Independency

INTRODUCTION

The right to privacy as part of human rights is guaranteed in Article 28G paragraph (1) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia which states that "Every person shall have the right to the protection of self, family, honor, dignity, and property under his power, as well as the right to feel secure and receive protection from the threat of fear to do or not to do something which is a human right." Therefore, the state is obliged to guarantee the protection of each individual's privacy and personal data, including within the scope of the digital space.

The massive development of technology raises new problems, one of which is personal data violation. According to data from Surf Shark cybersecurity company, Indonesia ranks third in the number of data leak cases globally. In the third quarter of 2022, around 12.74 million accounts experienced data leaks in Indonesia until September 13, 2022 (Fitri, 2018).

Considering the facts above, the state needs to protect personal data in the era of technological development, so Law Number 27 of 2022 concerning Personal Data Protection or *Perlindungan Data Pribadi* (PDP Law) was ratified. The ratification of this law is also an update to the guarantee of legal certainty of personal data protection in Indonesia as an implementation of human rights protection.

The government also stated that Indonesia wants to get an adequacy decision, namely an adequacy decision issued by the European Commission between the PDP Law and the European Union-General Data Protection Regulation (EU-GDPR). The EU-GDPR is the world's most comprehensive and progressive data protection law passed to respond to the implications of the digital era (Saputra, 2023).

To obtain an adequacy decision, a country must meet the standards in Article 45 of the EU-GDPR. First are the rule of law, respect for human rights, relevant regulations, public authority access to personal data, and security measures. Second, the implementing authority's existence and effective function for personal data supervision must have independent characteristics. Third, international commitments are made, especially related to personal data protection.

South Korea is one of the countries that has received the adequacy decision. South Korea has a specific authority to optimize personal data protection, namely the Personal Information Protection Commission (PIPC). The European Commission set the adequacy decision for South Korea in December 2021. PIPC is an independent institution and is under the office of the Prime Minister. Indonesia has regulated the personal data protection supervisory authority which is based on Article 58 of the Personal Data Protection Law (PDP Law). The implementing authority for personal data protection in Indonesia is under the President, and its formation is regulated through a Presidential Regulation (Perpres) (Herlien Budiono, 2015).

Bagir Manan stated that state agencies or state apparatus are limited to state organs that are elements of state organization, act for and on behalf of the state to determine the will of the state, and have the duty to carry out the will of the state based on the law.⁷ Meanwhile, the definition of an independent state authority according to Jimly Asshidiqie is a state organ expected to be independent of the legislative, executive, and judicial powers. However, in carrying out its functions there is still interference from these powers (Asshiddiqie, 2020).

The definition of personal data in Indonesia is stated in Article 1 Number 1 of Law Number 27 of 2022 concerning Personal Data Protection (PDP Law). Personal Data is data about a person that can be identified separately or combined with other information directly or indirectly through electronic or non-electronic systems.

The UN Special Rapporteur on the Promotion and Protection of the Right to Freedom of Opinion and Expression stated in its report in 2011 that the protection of personal data is a form of special respect for the right to privacy as part of human rights (Wibawana, 2024). Therefore, it is necessary for a data protection authority to legally establish its mandate, powers, and independence as executor of personal data protection.

Based on this consideration, it is necessary to identify and analyze the comparison of the regulation of personal data protection supervisory agencies between Indonesia and South Korea and the design of Indonesia's personal data protection supervisory agencies to meet the adequacy decision based on Indonesia's constitutional system.

A research topic similar to this study is a comparative study related to the substance regulated in the two laws between the personal data protection law in Indonesia and other countries so that the discussion is broader, namely related to the regulation of personal data protection in each country while this research focuses more on personal data protection supervisory authority. This research is important to be conducted to examine the design of the personal data protection supervisory authority in Indonesia to obtain an adequacy decision based on the EU-GDPR like South Korea even though the authority is under the executive branch of power while still being in line with the constitutional system in Indonesia.

METHODS

This present research uses a normative juridical approach. According to Soerjono Soekanto, the normative juridical approach is legal research by examining library materials or secondary data as the basis for conducting research by searching for regulations and literature related to the problem being researched (Soekanto & Mamudji, 2010).

The specification in this study is descriptive-analytical, which is research that provides an overview of the applicable laws and regulations connected with applicable legal theories and practice of law enforcement. This research on the personal data protection supervisory authority used secondary data. Secondary data is obtained through official documents, books related to the object of research, previous research results, undergraduate theses, theses, dissertations, and related laws and regulations (Suteki & Taufani, 2020).

The data was collected through the literature study method or literature research, which is a way to collect data by utilizing written sources such as laws and regulations, books, journals, and previous research relevant to the personal data protection supervisory authority. This research analysis was carried out by qualitative analysis, namely research whose findings do not use calculations.

RESULTS

Indonesia also wants to get an adequacy decision issued by the European Commission between the PDP Law and the EU-GDPR. This means that Indonesia must meet the personal data protection requirements in Article 45 of the EU-GDPR,

namely having an independent and effective supervisory authority to protect personal data. If a country has obtained an adequacy decision, a third country or international organization is allowed to transfer data to the EU easily because the controller or processor does not need to apply additional legal and technical protections. The country outside the European Union that has received an adequacy decision is South Korea (Astuti, 2022).

In Indonesia, the authority or authority for personal data protection is regulated in Article 58 of the PDP Law. It is stated that personal data protection will be carried out by an authority responsible to the President. Further regulation related to this authority will be regulated through a presidential regulation. However, until now the presidential regulation has not been established (Religia, 2019).

Based on the Academic Manuscript of the Personal Data Protection Bill, there is an option to provide additional responsibilities and functions related to personal data protection to the pre-existing institution, the Central Information Commission or *Komisi Informasi Pusat* (KIP). This is because the Central Information Commission carries out its authority to protect the privacy of personal data as stipulated in Article 17 letters g, h, and j of Law Number 14 of 2008 concerning Public Information Disclosure. The article regulates the exceptions to public information disclosure in the context of personal data protection.

It is important to compare the regulations of personal data protection supervisory agencies or authorities in Indonesia with those in South Korea because both are unitary states in the form of republics. The system of government in these two countries has a division of power between the legislative, executive, and judicial institutions, as well as guaranteeing human rights in the country's constitution (Safriani, 2019). This comparison is necessary to obtain the design of personal data protection supervisory agencies in Indonesia to meet the adequacy decision of the European Commission.

This comparison uses the basis of Law Number 27 of 2022 concerning Personal Data Protection (PDP Law), Law Number 14 of 2008 concerning Public Information Disclosure (KIP Law) as a discourse from the government as the implementer of personal data protection, and the South Korean Personal Information Protection Act (PIPA) as follows:

Table 1. The Comparison of the Authorities' Position

Regulations	PIPA	PDP Law	KIP law
Objects of Protection	Personal Information	Personal Data	Public Information
Position	Independent	Not regulated	Independent
Accountability	Prime Minister which is a position under the president.	President	President and submit the implementation of functions, duties, and authorities to Indonesia's House of Representatives (DPR).
Functions	Supervising data breaches (including misuse of personal information and leaks), formulating policies related to data privacy, and supervising the implementation of PIPA.	Exercising personal data protection based on the PDP Law.	Setting the standard technical guidelines for public information services and resolving disputes related to public information through mediation or non-litigation resolution.

Source: Researchers' Data Processing

Table 2. The Comparison of the Agencies' Duties and Authorities

Regulations	PIPA	PDP Law	KIP Law
Having the task of carrying out the function of legislation.	Improving laws related to the protection of personal data. [Articles 7-8 paragraph (1) of the PIPA]	Not regulated	Not regulated
Having the task of studying, educating, and socializing the policy.	Having the task of studying, educating, and socializing the laws or regulations, policies, systems, and status of personal information. [Articles 7-8 paragraph (6) of the PIPA]	Not regulated	Not regulated
Assessment of personal data violation	Assessing factors of personal information violation. [Articles 7-9 paragraph (1) of the PIPA]	Not regulated	Not regulated
Assessment of Privacy Impacts	Appointing a privacy impact assessment authority, Developing and disseminating criteria for privacy impact assessments. [Chapters 7-9 paragraph (8) of the PIPA]	Not regulated	Not regulated
Having the authority to give administrative sanctions.	The imposition of administrative sanctions is in the form of administrative fines. [Articles 7-9 paragraph (15) of the PIPA]	Giving administrative sanctions. [Article 60 letter c of the PDP Law]	Not regulated
Having the authority to conduct meetings independently	Conducting meetings by the Chairman or at least two Commissioners of the Protection Commission concerning the protection of personal information. [Articles 7-9 paragraph (17) of the PIPA]	Not regulated	Not regulated

Source: Researchers' Data Processing

Table 3. The Comparison of the Agencies' Requirements, Recruitment Process, and Dismissal Mechanism

Regulations	PIPA	PDP Law	KIP Law
Composition	9 (nine) members. [Article 7-2 paragraph (1) PIPA]	Not regulated	7 (seven) members. [Article 25 paragraph (1) KIP Law]
Requirements	a. a. Level III officials or officials in senior executive services. b. b. Judges, prosecutors, or lawyers who have worked for over 10 years. c. c. Officials who have worked in public institutions for 3 years or more. d. d. Professors e. who have expertise in personal information f. e. Public officials in political service. [Article 7-2 paragraph g. (1) PIPE]	Not regulated	a. Indonesian citizens; b. having integrity and not doing immoral acts; c. has never been convicted for committing a criminal act that is threatened with a penalty of 5 (five) years or more; d. having knowledge and understanding in the field of public information disclosure as part of human rights and public policy; e. having experience in the activities of Public Agencies; f. willing to leave membership and his position in a Public Authority if appointed to

			be the members of the Information Commission; g. willing to work full-time; h. being at least 35 (thirty-five) years old; and i. having a healthy mind and body. [Article 30 paragraph (1) of the KIP Law]
Recruitment system	The Prime Minister proposes the Chairman and Vice-Chairman, and the other two Commissioners are proposed by The Chairman and two other commissioner members are recommended by the negotiating body of the political party in which the President is involved or is a member, and the other three are recommended by the negotiating body established by the President. [Article 7-2 paragraph (1) PIPE]	Not regulated	Candidates for members of the Central Information Commission are submitted to the House of Representatives of the Republic of Indonesia by the President as many as 21 candidates. The House of Representatives of the Republic of Indonesia elects members of the Central Information Commission through a fit and proper test. [Article 31 of the KIP Law]
Dismissal reason	<p>b. A. Unable to carry out his duties within a long period due to mental or physical disorders.</p> <p>c. b. Non-Korean citizens.</p> <p>d. c. Members of political parties.</p> <p>e. d. Bankrupt officials.</p> <p>f. e. Violating the Special Case Act on the Punishment of Crimes, the Law on the Protection of Children and Adolescents from Sexual Offenses, Article</p> <p>g. 355 or 356 of the Criminal Code. [Articles 7-5 of the PIPE]</p>	Not regulated	<p>a. died;</p> <p>b. has expired term of office;</p> <p>c. resign;</p> <p>d. convicted by a court decision that has permanent legal force with a minimum penalty of 5 (five) years in prison;</p> <p>e. having mental and physical illness and/or other causes resulting in the person concerned being unable to carry out his duties for 1 (one) consecutive year; or</p> <p>f. committing immoral acts and/or violating the code of ethics, the decision of which is determined by the Information Commission. [Article 34 paragraph (2) of the KIP Law]</p>
Term of Office	3 (three) years and can be appointed once in a row. [Article 7-4 of the PIPE]	Not regulated	4 (four) years and can be appointed one more time. [Article 33 of the KIP Law]

Through these comparisons, it is necessary to establish a specific authority with a single model focusing on carrying out the functions, duties, and authorities of personal data protection that meet international standards and remain in line with the constitutional system in Indonesia.

The main advantage of having a separate authority rather than two chambers is the ability to share knowledge and reduce conflicts between information disclosure tasks and the security of personal data. Most requests for information covered by information disclosure regulations often relate to personal data. With the existence of a single authority, the potential for inter-authority conflicts can be minimized and help overcome problems and possible institutional conflicts (Rahmah, 2022).

DISCUSSION

Supervision of personal data protection in Indonesia is still carried out sectorally under the authorities and regulations governing each sector. For example, in the banking sector, supervision of customer data is carried out by the Financial Services Authority or *Otoritas Jasa Keuangan* (OJK) while supervision of personal data in other sectors is under the

responsibility of the Ministry of Communication and Information Technology (Kemenkominfo) (Yusdiyanto, 2017). Therefore, a single design authority is needed to carry out data protection functions sectorally by complying with the EU-GDPR standards and remaining in line with Indonesia's constitutional system.

An adequacy decision is required to ensure the compliance of personal data protection regulations in Indonesia is in line with the EU-GDPR which will have an impact on several things, including ensuring data protection for individuals wherever their data is processed. Adequacy decision also plays a role in encouraging the development of the digital economy in Indonesia because, in the future, there will be no need to make a special agreement when transferring data between Indonesia and EU countries (Laksana, 2021).

One of the countries that has received an adequacy decision is South Korea because of the establishment of an institution called PIPC which can be a consideration for the design of the supervisory authority for personal data protection in Indonesia. Therefore, based on this reason, it can be regulated in the presidential regulation later related to the design of the authority for personal data protection in Indonesia as follows:

a. The Authority is Not Directly under the Ministries

Article 51 paragraph (1) of the EU-GDPR states that each Member State shall provide one or more independent public authorities responsible for monitoring the application of personal data protection regulation. South Korea's PIPC was initially under the Ministry of Home Affairs and Security, then in August 2020 an amendment was made to the PIPA to give the PIPC the power as an independent authority but remained under the supervision of the Prime Minister's office. However, the European Commission established an adequacy decision for South Korea in December 2021 (Saputra, 2023).

The supervisory authority for personal data protection in Indonesia must have a single and independent position under the executive while still carrying out its duties and authorities independently. It is not part of the supporting element which is a body responsible to the Minister as stipulated in Presidential Regulation (Perpres) Number 68 of 2019 concerning the Organization of State Ministries.

b. The Authority Has the Right to Assess the Factors of Personal Data Violation

Under Article 32 paragraph (1) of the EU-GDPR, the controller and processors shall implement appropriate technical and organizational measures to ensure a level of security appropriate to the risk. Thus, in South Korea, based on Article 8-2 of PIPA paragraph (1), the head of a central administrative authority may request PIPC to assess the incident factors of a personal information violation when a policy or system involving the processing of personal information is adopted or changed by the enactment of any regulation under its jurisdiction (Agusta, 2020).

Based on Article 8-2 paragraph (2), PIPC can suggest the heads of relevant authorities regarding matters that need to be done to improve the relevant laws and regulations by analyzing and examining the factors of personal information violations in the laws and regulations.

The personal data protection supervisory authority needs to adopt this authority to prevent the occurrence of personal data violations in each government-owned and private institution. This authority is in line with the principle of independent state institutions, namely state authority shall have the power to exercise judgement and discretion (Wahyudi, 2020).

The authority has the authority to assess the privacy impact in data protection as stated in Article 35 of the EU-GDPR which states that when a type of processing, particularly one using new technologies and taking into account the nature, scope, context, and purposes of the processing is likely to result in a high risk to the rights and freedoms of natural persons, the controller shall carry out an assessment of the impact of the envisaged processing operations on the protection of personal data.

In line with this, South Korea has accommodated this authority in Article 33 of the PIPA which states that if there is a risk of violation of personal information of data subjects due to the operation of personal information data that meet the criteria specified in the Presidential Decree, the heads of public institutions are obliged to conduct an assessment to analyze the risk factors and fix them, and submit the results to the PIPC. The PIPC, in this case, may appoint a person who meets the requirements specified by the Presidential Decree such as human resources and facilities as the institution that carries out the privacy impact assessment (hereinafter referred to as the assessment authority), and the heads of the public institutions request the assessment authority to conduct a privacy impact assessment. The PIPC is also required

to conduct socialization related to the privacy impact assessment criteria for institutions or individuals that carry out data processing.

Considering the case in Indonesia, there is a new technology system, namely the National Data Center under the Ministry of Communication and Information Technology to prevent hacking by Ransomware that has occurred today. In the processing of personal data carried out by the National Data Center, the privacy impact is first assessed by the assessment authority so there are no errors in the data management, namely the absence of data backup. This authority needs to be adopted in the personal data protection supervisory authority in Indonesia to ensure that there are no data subject rights that are violated due to the processing of personal data carried out by institutions or individuals.

c. The Authority Has the Right to Impose Administrative Sanctions

The recital of 150 EU-GDPR confirms that to strengthen and harmonize administrative sanctions for violations of this regulation, each supervisory authority shall have the authority to impose administrative fines. The Personal Data Protection Supervisory Authority in Indonesia has the authority to impose administrative sanctions.

Based on Article 213 paragraph (2) of the Implementing Regulation Bill of the PDP Law, the types of administrative sanctions in this case are in the form of a written warning, temporary suspension of data processing, or imposing administrative fines. The imposition of administrative sanctions is carried out by the head of the personal data protection supervisory authority in the form of a decision after a series of examinations are carried out. When there is an element of a criminal act, the personal data protection supervisory authority can submit the verification results to law enforcement officials (Dewi, 2016). Therefore, this authority shall have an independent position so that in determining a decision there is no intervention from any party.

d. The Authority Has a Duty to Propose Changes to Laws or Regulations Related to Personal Data Protection

Article 57 paragraph (1) letter c of the EU-GDPR states that the personal data protection supervisory authority may advise, in accordance with the Member States laws, the national parliament, the government, and other institutions and bodies on legislative and administrative measures relating to the protection of natural persons' rights and freedoms with regard to data processing.

The supervisory authority for personal data protection needs to be given the task of proposing changes to the law regarding the processing of personal data and the guarantee of the rights of data subjects as in the practice of Indonesian constitution, namely the Ombudsman of the Republic of Indonesia which is based on Article 8 paragraph (2) of Law Number 37 of 2008 concerning the Ombudsman of the Republic of Indonesia which has the authority to submit suggestions to the House of Representatives and/or the President, The Regional People's Representative Council and/or regional heads should make changes to other laws and regulations to prevent maladministration.

e. The Authority Has the Duty to Conduct Socialization to the Public Related to the Personal Data Protection Law

Article 57 paragraph (1) letter b of the EU-GDPR mandates that the data protection authority shall promote public awareness and understanding of the risks, rules, safeguards, and rights related to processing.

Based on Article 59 of the PDP Law, the supervisory authority for personal data protection in Indonesia formulates and determines the Personal Data Protection policies and strategies that become guidelines for Personal Data Subjects, Personal Data Controllers, and Personal Data Processors, so it is necessary to conduct socialization related to the policies that have been formulated to the public (Kim & Shin, 2020).

f. The Decision-Making Can Be Done Independently

Article 52 paragraph (2) of the EU-GDPR states that in carrying out their duties and exercising their powers under these regulations, the member or members of each supervisory authority shall remain free from external influence, whether direct or indirect, and shall neither seek or take instructions from anybody.

Decision-making in the personal data protection supervisory authority in Indonesia can be carried out with a collegial collective system, meaning that the decision-making is carried out through a deliberative mechanism to reach consensus or voting.²⁷ Therefore, an odd number of members is required.

g. The Recruitment Mechanism is Carried out Transparently: Member Requirements Emphasis on Competence

Article 53 paragraph (1) of the EU-GDPR states that Member States shall provide for each member of their supervisory authorities to be appointed by means of a transparent procedure by their parliament; their government; their head of State; or an independent body entrusted with the appointments under the Member State law.

The characteristic of an independent state authority is that the appointment process is carried out through selection that is not affected by political factors but is based on objective criteria. This can be done by opening up opportunities for the public to choose their representatives, without interference from political parties or certain power monopolies.²⁸

In the Indonesian constitution, the process of selecting members of independent state agencies can be carried out by forming a special selection team such as in the General Election Commission recruitment process. The selection team is appointed by the president which includes academics, community, and professionals, and then a fit and proper test is carried out. The election process through this mechanism is closer to the people following the characteristics of an independent state authority.

h. The Member Requirement Emphasizes Competence

Article 53 paragraph (2) of the EU-GDPR states that each member shall have the qualifications, experience, and skills, particularly in the area of personal data protection required to perform its duties and exercise its powers (Al Aldo, 2018). It is essential to ensure that there is a regulation related to the requirement that members of the data protection authority have competence, qualifications, and knowledge related to personal data protection to understand and implement personal data protection properly.

i. The Members Can be Dismissed If They Commit a Criminal Act and Violate the Code of Ethics

Article 53 paragraph (4) of the EU-GDPR states that a member will be dismissed only in cases of serious misconduct or if the member no longer fulfills the conditions required for the performance of the duties. It is in line with the characteristics of an independent state authority where the dismissal and appointment of members uses a certain mechanism that is specially regulated, not solely based on the will of the political appointee (Riwanto, 2017).

The personal data protection supervisory authority needs to ensure that in its regulations there are conditions for dismissal and resignation, at least regulating the reason for dismissal because the member has violated the law and the code of ethics. The mechanism of dismissal and resignation must also be regulated with minimal intervention from the three branches of power to avoid conflicts of interest.

j. The Term of Office is Definitively Regulated and Members Can Be Reappointed in One Period

Article 54 paragraph (1) letters d and e states that the duration of the term of the member or members of each supervisory authority of no less than four years, except for the first appointment after 24 May 2016, part of which may take place for a shorter period where that is necessary to protect the independence and of the supervisory authority. The member or members of each supervisory authority is eligible for reappointment.

This is in line with the characteristics of an independent state authority, namely the term of office of the head of an authority is definitive, ends at the same time, and can be extended for one subsequent period (Jazuly, 2015). It is required that the regulation of the supervisory authority or authority for personal data protection in the Presidential Regulation ensures that the term is definitive, which is five years like other state auxiliary institutions, and also the members can be reappointed in the next period to ensure the independence of the institution.

CONCLUSION

The authority in the PDP, KIP, and PIPC Law has differences in its position and authority, the PIPC and KIP are independent under the executive, while the PDP Law authority is also under the executive but its independence needs to be reassured. The main functions of the PIPA are to control data violations and formulate privacy policies, while the PDP Law authority is to protect data based on regulations, and the KIP is to establish technical standards for public information services and to resolve non-litigation disputes. There is a difference in the emphasis on their duties and authorities. The KIP and the PDP Law focus on law enforcement, while the PIPC is more on data security measures.

The design of the personal data protection supervisory authority based on the comparison between PIPA, PDP LAW, and KIP LAW, under the EU-GDPR and the Indonesian constitutional system, includes a single independent authority not under the ministry, having the task of proposing changes to the data protection law, being able to make decisions independently, being able to conduct privacy impact assessments and factors assessment of personal data protection violations, having transparent recruitment, requiring competent members, having a regulation that members are dismissed if they violate the law or code of ethics, and regulating the term of office definitively.

This study concludes that the personal data protection supervisory authority not only carries out its function in law enforcement on personal data protection but also needs to carry out supervision as a measure to prevent personal data violation. Therefore, it is suggested that the government should accommodate, in the PDP Law, the position of an independent authority. Moreover, the task of the protection authority is to be able to propose changes to the personal data protection law, socializing policies related to personal data protection to the public, ensuring that members of the authority can make all decisions without being intervened by anybody, including in imposing administrative sanctions and adopting the authority of related institutions by conducting privacy impact assessments and assessing factors of personal data protection violations. Furthermore, the government is expected to immediately ratify a Presidential Regulation that accommodates the requirements for members of the data protection authority stating that the members shall have competence, the recruitment process is carried out through a fit and proper test, and involves the community. In addition, the dismissal mechanism can also be accommodated through the Presidential Regulation to create legal certainty, and the term of office must be definitively regulated, namely 5 (five years).

REFERENCES

- [1] Agusta, H. (2020). Perlindungan Data Pribadi Penerima Pinjaman Dalam Transaksi Pinjam Meminjam Uang Berbasis Teknologi Informasi (Peer To Peer Lending). *Jurnal Hukum & Pembangunan*, 50(4), 789–809.
- [2] Al Aldo, M. (2018). Pengaplikasian Kepemimpinan Kolektif Kolegial Organisasi Muhammadiyah. *Jurnal Kajian Islam Dan Pendidikan*, 2(2), 123.
- [3] Asshiddiqie, J. (2020). *Pancasila: Identitas Konstitusi Berbangsa Dan Bernegara* (1st ed.). Raja Grafindo Persada.
- [4] Astuti, R. S. (2022). *Jutawan dan Miliarder Tuban Kini Merawat "Uang Lahan" Kilang Minyak*. Kompas.Id. <https://www.kompas.id/baca/nusantara/2022/01/27/kisah-miliuner-tuban-merawat-berkah-dari-lahan-kilang-minyak>
- [5] Dewi, S. (2016). Konsep Perlindungan Hukum Atas Privasi Dan Data Pribadi Dikaitkan Dengan Penggunaan Cloud Computing Di Indonesia. *Jurnal Yustisia*, 5(1), 68.
- [6] Fitri, A. S. (2018). "Polemik Pengaturan Kepemilikan Data Pribadi : Urgensi Untuk Harmonisasi Dan Reformasi Hukum Di Indonesia." 48, no. 4 (2018): 819. *Jurnal Hukum & Pembangunan*, 48(2), 819.
- [7] Herlien Budiono. (2015). *Asas Keseimbangan bagi Hukum Perjanjian Indonesia*. Citra Aditya Bakti.
- [8] Jazuly, Y. (2015). Independent Agencies Dalam Struktur Ketatanegaraan Indonesia. *Supremasi Hukum*, 1(1), 172.
- [9] Kim, M. J., & Shin, B. H. (2020). *Comprehensive Guidelines on Processing Pseudonymized Data*. Shin & Kim LLC's.
- [10] Laksana, A. A. (2021). *Mendorong Perkembangan Ekonomi Digital Melalui Pemenuhan Adequacy Decision EU-GDPR: Perbandingan Lembaga Pelaksana PDP Indonesia dan Argentina* (1st ed.). Pt Bumi Aksara.
- [11] Rahmah, R. N. (2022). Membangun Kesadaran Keamanan Siber pada Konsumen E- commerce di Indonesia. *Journal Trade and Development Study*, 4(2), 6.
- [12] Religia, M. A. (2019). Permasalahan Hukum Tanggung Jawab Sosial Perusahaan (Corporate Social Responsibility) di Indonesia. *University of Bengkulu Law Journal*, 4(2), 46.
- [13] Riwanto, A. (2017). Mewujudkan Hukum Berkeadilan Secara Progresif Perspektif Pancasila. *Jurnal Ilmu Syari'ah Dan Hukum*, 2(2), 4.
- [14] Safriani, A. (2019). Komparasi Konstitusi Negara Modern Antara Indonesia Dan Korea Selatan. *Jurnal Perbandingan Mazhab*, 2(1), 205.
- [15] Saputra, A. R. (2023). *UU PDP Akan Permudah Pertukaran Data dengan Negara Lain*. Kementerian Komunikasi Dan Informatika.
- [16] Soekanto, S., & Mamudji, S. (2010). *Penelitian Hukum Normatif: Suatu Tinjauan Singkat* (1st ed.). Rajawali Pers.
- [17] Suteki, & Taufani, G. (2020). *Metodologi Penelitian Hukum (Filsafat, Teori dan Praktik)* (1st ed.). Rajawali Pers.
- [18] Wahyudi, A. (2020). Eksistensi Peradilan Khusus Penyelesaian Perselisihan Hasil Pemilihan Kepala Daerah Di Indonesia. *Jurnal Kompilasi Hukum*, 5(2), 67. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.29303/jkh.v5i2.58>
- [19] Wibawana, W. A. (2024). Apa Itu Proyek Strategis Nasional (PSN)? Simak Penjelasannya. Detik News. <https://news.detik.com/berita/d-7261975/apa-itu-proyek-strategis-nasional-psn-simak-penjasannya>
- [20] Yusdiyanto, Y. (2017). Makna Filosofis Nilai-Nilai Sila Ke-Empat Pancasila Dalam Sistem Demokrasi Di Indonesia. *FIAT JUSTISIA*, 10(2), 251–272. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.25041/fiatjustisia.v10n02.623>