

The Global Atlas: from regulation to action, Free Edition

Every major artificial intelligence governance regime on one map, with its verified status and the first action to take. Version 3, verified second quarter 2026.

Abbreviations and acronyms

No prior knowledge is assumed. Every acronym used in this document is spelled out below.

Acronym	Full form
AI	artificial intelligence
EU AI Act	the European Union Artificial Intelligence Act, Regulation (EU) 2024/1689
LGPD	Lei Geral de Protecao de Dados, Brazil's General Data Protection Law, Law 13.709/2018
ISO/IEC 42001	the AI management system standard published by the International Organization for Standardization and the International Electrotechnical Commission in December 2023
NIST AI RMF	the Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework of the United States National Institute of Standards and Technology
TRAIGA	the Texas Responsible Artificial Intelligence Governance Act, House Bill 149
BIPA	the Biometric Information Privacy Act of the State of Illinois (2008)
OECD	the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
UNESCO	the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
ASEAN	the Association of Southeast Asian Nations
AU	the African Union
UAE	the United Arab Emirates
PDPC	Singapore's Personal Data Protection Commission
METI	Japan's Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry
SDAIA	the Saudi Data and Artificial Intelligence Authority

Why this atlas exists

Most artificial intelligence governance guidance is written as if every organization answered to Brussels or Washington. It does not. Your obligations may be written in Brasilia, Lima, Nairobi, Singapore, Seoul, or Abu Dhabi, and they are moving fast. This atlas puts every major regime on one map, so that an organization anywhere, from a three-person team to a national ministry, can see what applies to it and what to do first.

How to read this atlas

Each entry names the instrument, its legal status with the date it was verified, what it asks of you, and the first action to take. Three disciplines govern every entry. First, every status is verified as of the second quarter of 2026, and regulation moves, which is why the atlas is refreshed quarterly. Second, this atlas is governance guidance, not legal advice in any jurisdiction. Third, where a regime is a draft or a national strategy rather than binding law, the entry says so plainly.

Europe: the regime the world is converging on

The EU AI Act, Regulation (EU) 2024/1689: Status: in force, with obligations phasing in on published dates (verified Q2 2026). It classifies systems into four risk tiers and provides administrative fines of up to 35 million euros or 7 percent of worldwide annual turnover for prohibited practices. Its AI literacy obligation applies since February 2025. First action: classify every system with the free EU AI Act quick classification, then document conformity with the EU AI Act Compliance Pack.

The United States: federal level

The NIST AI RMF and the federal landscape: Status: the NIST AI RMF is voluntary federal guidance, and no comprehensive federal AI statute is in force; a proposed federal moratorium on state AI laws was removed from the 2025 budget reconciliation bill by a 99 to 1 Senate vote, so the state patchwork below stands (verified Q2 2026). First action: build the AI Governance Crosswalk Matrix against the four NIST functions, Govern, Map, Measure, Manage, so every control you document once is reusable in every state pack below.

The United States: state level

With no comprehensive federal statute, the binding AI law of the United States is being written in the state capitols. The entries below are the regimes with penalties and dates. Most copy one another's logic, so an organization that satisfies Colorado in substance is largely ready for the rest.

Colorado, the Colorado AI Act, SB 24-205: Status: enacted in May 2024, taking effect on June 30, 2026 after the legislature moved the date in a 2025 special session; the first comprehensive state AI law (verified Q2 2026). It requires developers and deployers of high-risk AI systems, in hiring, lending, insurance, housing, and similar consequential decisions, to use reasonable care against algorithmic discrimination, with impact assessments and consumer notices. First action: run the Algorithmic Impact Assessment Builder on every consequential-decision system, then issue the consumer notices with the AI Transparency Disclosure Builder.

Texas, TRAIGA, House Bill 149: Status: in force since January 1, 2026 (verified Q2 2026). A prohibited-practices law reaching government and private deployment, paired with a regulatory sandbox, and enforced by the state attorney general. First action: the Prohibited-Practices Register, screening every deployed system against the statute's prohibited-use categories.

Illinois, BIPA and House Bill 3773: Status: both in force; BIPA since 2008 with a private right of action that has produced some of the largest privacy settlements in the United States, and HB 3773, which amends the Illinois Human Rights Act to govern AI in employment decisions, since January 1, 2026 (verified Q2

2026). First action: the Biometric Consent Tracker on any system that touches biometric data, then document employment decisions with the Human-in-the-Loop Decision Guide.

New York City, Local Law 144: Status: in force and enforced since July 2023 (verified Q2 2026). It requires an independent annual bias audit and candidate notice for automated employment decision tools used on New York City candidates. First action: the Annual Bias Audit Playbook, which schedules the independent audit and carries the candidate-notice templates.

California, the transparency cluster: Status: phasing in; the AI Transparency Act, SB 942, applies from January 1, 2026, the privacy regulator's rules on automated decision-making technology were finalized in 2025, and SB 53 governs frontier-model developers (verified Q2 2026). First action: the AI Content Labeling Kit for the SB 942 provenance duties, then the AI Risk Quick-Screen against the automated decision-making rules.

Utah, the AI Policy Act, SB 149: Status: in force since May 2024, the first state generative AI disclosure statute (verified Q2 2026). It requires clear disclosure when consumers interact with generative AI, with heightened duties in regulated occupations. First action: run the AI Use-Case Intake Form to surface every consumer-facing conversational system, with heightened-duty flags for the regulated occupations.

The pattern to note: these statutes converge on the same four demands as the rest of this map, risk classification, human oversight, transparency, and documented accountability. Govern once against the convergent core, and each new state law becomes a localization at the edges, not a new program.

Latin America and Brazil

Brazil, Bill PL 2338/2023: Status: approved by the Federal Senate in December 2024 and now before the Chamber of Deputies; advancing, not yet law (verified Q2 2026). A comprehensive risk-based bill deliberately aligned with the European tier logic. First action: inventory and classify your systems by risk now, because the Brazilian tiers mirror the European ones your instruments already serve.

Brazil, the LGPD, Law 13.709/2018: Status: in force (verified Q2 2026). Brazil's data protection law already governs automated decision-making, including review rights over automated decisions. First action: run the AI Use-Case Intake Form on every system that touches personal data.

Peru, Law 31814 of 2023: Status: in force, the first national AI law in Latin America (verified Q2 2026). A promotion-and-principles law that signals where enforcement will follow. First action: the Governance Readiness Scorecard.

Chile, Colombia, and Mexico: Status: national strategies and draft bills in progress, most following the risk-based pattern (verified Q2 2026). First action: govern against the convergent core now, so that whichever bill lands first, you are already compliant in substance.

Africa

The AU Continental AI Strategy: Status: adopted in July 2024, the umbrella framework for all 55 member states (verified Q2 2026). First action: the Governance Readiness Scorecard, aligned to the strategy's capability pillars.

Nigeria, Kenya, and Rwanda: Status: Nigeria's National AI Strategy (2024), Kenya's National AI Strategy 2025 to 2030, and Rwanda's National AI Policy (2023) are adopted national strategies, not yet binding statutes (verified Q2 2026). First action: the AI Literacy Quick-Check and the Readiness Scorecard, because strategy-to-implementation is precisely where these markets stand, and where the advantage is won.

Asia-Pacific

Singapore: Status: the PDPC Model AI Governance Framework, its generative AI edition (2024), and AI Verify, the first government-backed AI testing toolkit; voluntary but the region's de facto practice standard (verified Q2 2026). First action: the AI Governance Health Score, which maps naturally onto Singapore's testable-governance philosophy.

South Korea, the AI Basic Act: Status: enacted in December 2024 and in force since January 2026, the world's second comprehensive AI law (verified Q2 2026). First action: risk classification and human-oversight documentation, using the Human-in-the-Loop Decision Guide.

Japan: Status: a soft-law approach through the METI AI Guidelines for Business, alongside a light-touch AI promotion law of 2025 (verified Q2 2026). First action: the Responsible AI Principles, adopted as internal policy.

China: Status: binding rules in force, including the Interim Measures for Generative AI (2023) and the algorithm recommendation and deep synthesis regulations (verified Q2 2026). First action: the AI Transparency Disclosure Builder, since labeling and disclosure duties sit at the center of the Chinese regime.

ASEAN: Status: the Guide on AI Governance and Ethics (2024) covering the bloc, including Thailand and the Philippines; voluntary (verified Q2 2026). First action: the Governance Readiness Scorecard.

Australia: Status: the Voluntary AI Safety Standard, with mandatory guardrails for high-risk settings proposed (verified Q2 2026). First action: the AI Risk Quick-Screen against the standard's ten guardrails.

The Middle East

The UAE: Status: the National AI Strategy 2031 and the world's first Minister of State for AI; strategy-led, procurement-enforced (verified Q2 2026). First action: the Board and Executive Governance Pack, because in strategy-led regimes, governance is proven at the leadership table.

Saudi Arabia: Status: the SDAIA AI ethics principles; national-authority guidance (verified Q2 2026). First action: the AI Ethics Self-Assessment, mapped to the SDAIA principles.

The global connective tissue

The OECD AI Principles: updated in 2024, the reference point most national strategies cite (verified Q2 2026).

The UNESCO Recommendation on the Ethics of AI: adopted in 2021 by more than 190 countries, and the instrument most African and Latin American governments cite (verified Q2 2026).

The Council of Europe Framework Convention on AI: opened in 2024, the first binding international treaty on AI (verified Q2 2026).

ISO/IEC 42001 and the NIST AI RMF: the certifiable management standard (December 2023) and the four-function method (Govern, Map, Measure, Manage) that regimes worldwide borrow from (verified Q2 2026).

These five are the crosswalk backbone. Govern once against them, and most national regimes are largely satisfied in substance.

The pattern this map reveals

Read together, the regimes converge on four demands: risk-based classification, human oversight, transparency, and documented accountability. The strategic consequence is powerful. An organization that governs once against the convergent core, then localizes at the edges, is substantially ready everywhere, from Sao Paulo to Seoul. That localization, obligation by obligation and instrument by instrument, is exactly what the full atlas does.

Where the free edition stops

This free edition gives you the WHAT and the WHY: every major regime, its verified status, and the first action. The full Global Regulation-to-Action Atlas, part of the paid catalog, maps each regime obligation by obligation to the specific AI GOVERNANCE CHAIN™ instrument that satisfies it, right-sized from a three-person team to a national ministry, and is kept current by the quarterly Regulatory Update Service. This atlas also feeds CHAINGUIDE™, the disagreement engine, so a visitor in Bogota, Dakar, or Manila can ask what applies to them and receive a cited answer.

Your next step: Get the [Global Regulation Atlas, Full Edition](http://www.aigovernancechain.com/storefront.html) in the Execution Library (www.aigovernancechain.com/storefront.html, section: The Flagship Packs). Every instrument in the Execution Library is also included in the [Governance Vault](#), the all-access annual licence.

AI GOVERNANCE CHAIN™ | Human-first AI governance framework

© 2026 Mathieu K. Gouanou. All rights reserved. | Member, Harvard Business Review Advisory Council.

Document standard: human-first AI governance.