



Digital Management of Traditional Cultural Expressions: Why It is Needed in the Context of Gaining the Benefit-Sharing

Ni Ketut Supasti Dharmawan¹, Desak Putu Dewi Kasih², Putu Aras Samsithawrati³,
Putri Triari Dwijyanthi⁴

^{1, 2, 3, 4} Faculty of Law, Universitas Udayana, Denpasar, Indonesia

supasti_dharmawan@unud.ac.id¹,
dewi_kasih@unud.ac.id², samsithawrati@unud.ac.id³,
putritriari@unud.ac.id⁴

Abstract. The success of inventorying, recording, and issuing of Recording Letters for Traditional Cultural Expressions works as part of Communal Intellectual Property from Bali is still accompanied by challenges. Those are uploading and commercialization of Communal Intellectual Property works documentation as personal video works and photos on digital platforms. This study aims to analyze the arrangement of Traditional Cultural Expressions as part of Communal Intellectual Property works including its benefit-sharing mechanism in Indonesia and to elaborate model of strengthening the protection of communal works through the existence of a digital management mechanism, as well as the presence of the state in ongoing facilitation activities in the context of the state as the owner of Communal Intellectual Property. This study uses the socio-legal research method with statutory, economic, social, cultural, and technological approaches. The study results show that Bali is very rich in Communal Intellectual Property works that have not been fully inventoried. However, there are quite sufficient regulations already regulating Communal Intellectual Property except for benefit-sharing which remains unclear. Besides that, even though Communal Intellectual Property work has been registered and has a letter as recording proof the Community of Origin does not receive yet the benefit, in the context of benefit-sharing, of the commercialization of such works through the creation of individual intellectual property works like photo or video created by other people. Bearing in mind that the works of the custodial community have been preserved and developed for generations from generation to generation in today's technological era. The example of uploading practice of communal intellectual property documentation to social media by other people has a detrimental impact on custodians who have such communal intellectual property as their source is used as a personal creation. Facing such a phenomenon, a relevant model for strengthening communal intellectual property is through a hy-

brid inventory. First, it needs a recording certificate. Second, the custodial community needs to empower communal intellectual property digital management by having official social media accounts as a vehicle for information and announcing their works internationally.

Keywords: Digital Management, Traditional Cultural Expressions, Benefit Sharing

1 Introduction

Bali is a province in Indonesia that is famous for its tourism as it has beautiful nature, heritage, and culture (Utama et al, 2023). Bali's natural beauty is very well known overseas so there is no need to doubt it, as well as its very diverse cultures. For example, one of the most awaited activities by tourists when visiting Bali is watching Balinese dances as a form of its unique culture. Among these various dances, some are traditional Balinese dances which are the personal intellectual property (hereinafter referred to as IP) work of a creator and some are traditional dances as a form of Communal IP work, which is passed down from generation to generation, carried out by the Community of Origin from a region. What is interesting between the two types of works is the issue related to Communal IP works jointly carried out by the Community of Origin. So far, the success story of inventorying, recording, and issuing Recording Letter (Surat Pencatatan) for Traditional Cultural Expressions (hereinafter referred to as TCEs) works, such as dance, as part of Communal IP is still accompanied by challenges. Those are uploading and commercialization of the Communal IP works documentation as personal video works and photos on digital platforms. Many performance venues in Bali that display Communal IP works do not yet have an awareness of the importance of benefit-sharing that they should be able to get if their communal works are taken in videos and photos by other people such as visitors and uploaded for commercial purposes. Therefore, viewers are not prohibited from taking pictures or videos of the Communal IP works for personal or commercial purposes. In fact, if a picture or video from a Communal IP works, for example, is uploaded to someone social media who is a well-known influencer and the video is watched a lot, the video will generate a lot of money and the one who gets it is the influencer as the party who uploaded the video as the work of his personal IP. Thus, this Community of Origin will not gain any economic benefit from that.

The lack of Community of Origin (or custodian community) awareness in dealing with the problems of taking pictures and recording videos by other people or tourists on the performed Communal IP works makes these video works and photos which were previously shown as Communal IP works, now become videos and photos of personal works of other people, as an interesting issue. There is an urgency to analyze and overcome these problems. In general, IP provides room for the people who created them opportunity to make a return on their investment in creativity through the existence of exclusive right (Burch et al, 2023). IP consisted of individual and communal IP. As a member country of the TRIPs Agreement is obliged to protect IPs, not

only the individual one but also the communal IPs (Kasih et al in ICBLT Proceeding, 2023). One example of communal IP in Indonesia is TCEs. Under Article 5 (1) of the Government Regulation Number 56 of 2022 on Communal IP (hereinafter Government Regulation 56/2022), TCEs have moral rights that are inclusive, supported, and/or carried out by the Community of Origin, that have economic benefits, and valid indefinitely. In brief, the Community of Origin is the one that develops Communal IP communally and across generations. In addition, TCEs is also regulated under Law Number 28 of 2014 on Copyright (hereinafter Law 28/2014). The realization of a work of creativity originating from the rationality, creativity, thought, and intellectual ability of creators is of course closely related to the energy, time, and effort that has been expended by that person (Samsithawrati et al, 2023). From the above, it is noted that the economic value of IP work, including TCEs, is of course very important.

Recently, the sight of people busy recording and taking pictures of every event, including performances, is very common. This is because technology such as smartphones is no longer a luxury item but is affordable to almost all groups of people. Many of the latest smartphone brands have emerged at competitive prices (Aranski and Rizki, 2018). Only by having a smartphone and uploading content to social media like YouTube constitutes an attractive alternative for people to earn easy money (Minniarni, Novriadi and Sepika, 2020). But unfortunately, not everyone who uploads content to social media is aware of whether the content he uploads is really his own work and does not reduce or harm the economic rights of other people. If so, for example, if the YouTuber uploads and obtains monetization for dance performance which is communal IP work carried out by a Community of Origin, what is the benefit-sharing mechanism that must be carried out so as not to harm the economic rights of other parties. In fact, the private sector has started to become aware of the economic rights that arise from recording videos and taking images of their performances that have the potential to be uploaded and commercialized by other parties on their social media accounts. An example is the Devdan show in Bali, which performs various dances, one of which is a Balinese dance, banning visitors from using cameras or taking any pictures or videos during the show (see Wandernesia; and Devdan). This indicates the awareness of the private sector on digital management related to IP has started to exist. However, unfortunately, it does not yet exist for the Community of Origin. They are still not fully aware of the existence of Communal IP and the importance of getting their works protected under the IP regime as well as gaining economic benefits from these works. In addition, from the regulatory perspective itself, the benefit-sharing mechanism for Communal IP works remains unclear as no laws and regulations on IP and Communal IP regulate it.

Based on the above background, therefore, the legal issues raised in this paper are: (1) how is the arrangement of TCEs as part of Communal IP including its benefit-sharing in Indonesia; and (2) what is the suitable digital management model to strengthen the protection of TCEs as part of communal IP? This article has its own originality because when compared with similar previous studies such as those conducted by: (1) Dharmawan et al (2023) entitled Protection Strengthening Model of Communal Intellectual Property: Transplanting the Policy Content Including Benefit-

Sharing on Act Based, it focuses more on the model to strengthen Communal IP works based on the transplantation of policy content from various existing legal policies and sources in local, national and international level; and (2) Bin Liu (2023) entitled Research on Intellectual Property Right Protection of Genetic Resources in China under Benefit-Sharing focuses more on China's benefit-sharing mechanism on genetic resources, while this article focuses on the arrangement of TCEs as part of Communal IP including its benefit-sharing in Indonesia and the suitable digital management model to strengthen the protection of TCEs as part of communal IP.

2 Method

This research employs socio-legal research. According to Reza Banakar, socio-legal research must acknowledge the dynamic and multidimensional nature of legal phenomena (Fachrizal Afandi, 2022). Laws can take different forms and each aspect of them can be viewed from a different perspective (Ibid). Therefore, to elaborate on legal issues on the digital management of TCEs and why it is needed in the context of gaining the benefit-sharing, this article uses statutory, economic, social, cultural, and technological approaches.

3 Discussion

3.1 The Arrangement of Traditional Cultural Expressions as Part of Communal Intellectual Property and Its Benefit-Sharing Mechanism in Indonesia

Today, IP is a familiar subject matter. Almost every aspect of everyday human life comes into contact with IP. It is just that people often do not realize that this is part of a work that is protected by the IP law regime. Music, dance, smartphone, and painting are only small samples of IP. Question is, what is IP? Taufik H. Simatupang (2021) argues that in the implementation of human rights context in Indonesia, IP can also be seen as a property right, which is a right that cannot be taken by anyone arbitrarily. So, the government is obliged to protect against the implementation of this human right. Jay Dratler Jr. (1991) argues IP that focuses on intangible rights confers the same rights as owners of other types of property namely the right to exclude others from accessing or using the subject matter being protected (Dratler, 2006).

In the beginning, IP focused on protecting individual works, however, as time went on, IP protection for communal works is also known, as it was known as Communal IP. In Indonesia, Communal IP is regulated in various laws and regulations such as Ministry of Law and Human Rights Regulation Number 13 of 2017 on Communal IP Data (hereinafter referred to as Ministry of Law and Human Rights Regulation 13/2017), Government Regulation 56/2022 as the newest one, as well as several articles under Law 28/2014, Law Number 20 of 2016 on Trademark and Geographical Indication as well as Law Number 13 of 2016 on Patent. As already mentioned, the arrangement of Communal IP is still scattered in various laws and regulations. Dhar-

mawan et al (2023) argue that legal transplantation model seems relevant to be used as an alternative solution, namely by transplanting various existing legal provisions on Communal IP and policies at the international level related to the substance or content of Communal IP protection including the inventory, recording mechanism, permits related to prior information approval, the inclusion of Communal IP sources, as well as legal subjects required to provide benefit-sharing related to commercial use of Communal IP into a Law concerning Communal IP protection (Dharmawan et al, Ibid).

According to Article 1 (1) of the Government Regulation 56/2022, Communal IP is defined as IP whose ownership is communal and has economic value while upholding the nation's moral, social and cultural values. Types of Communal IP consist of TCEs, Traditional Knowledge, Genetic Resources, Indication of Origin and Potential of Geographical Indication (Article 4 of the Government Regulation 56/2022). This article focuses on TCEs, specifically those like dances or music performed by the Community of Origin and then being recorded and pictures being taken by others for other's commercial purposes without any benefit-sharing.

TCEs are related to a collective entity, namely a group of people, a community, a small group, or indigenous people. Traditional cultural expressions do not have individual characteristics since they express a shared cultural identity (Kusuma and Roisah et al, 2022). Further, the law itself defines TCEs as all forms of expression of copyrighted works, whether in the form of objects or intangibles or a combination of both which shows the existence of a traditional culture that is held communally and across generations (Article 1 (2) of the Government Regulation 56/2022). Specifically, for a work to be considered as TCEs shall meet the following criteria set by the regulation: (a) contain traditional values, perspectives, and forms, and is structured, maintained, and developed both within and outside of traditional contexts; (b) managed and carried out communally and collectively by customary law communities and/or local communities as their Community of Origin; (c) continuously developed by the Community of Origin in response to the environment, nature, and history; (d) maintained, used, and passed on across generations; and (e) provide awareness of identity, sustainability, and promote respect for cultural diversity and creativity (Article 6 of Government Regulation 56/2022).

Moving forward, in Indonesia, types of TCEs consist of verbal textual, music, movement, theatre, fine arts, traditional ceremonies, architecture, landscapes, and/or other forms of expression according to developments (Article 7(1) of the Government Regulation 56/2022). In Bali, which is famous for its tourism industry, of course, a lot of TCEs works, for example, Balinese communal dances, are performed as part of the industry. Some of those dances are sacred and some do not. Although the Laws and Regulations do not state specifically the categorization of TCEs works as sacred and not, Kasih et al (2023) bring forward the concept of "Closed" and "Open" TCEs (Kasih et al in Jurnal Jatiswara, 2023). "Closed" TCEs means that the works cannot be used commercially as it contains sacred values of the Community of Origin (Ibid). For example, Drama Tari Wayang Wong Pura Dhang Kahyangan Taman Pule Desa Adat Mas has sacred value and therefore, can only be performed for specific ritual ceremony and can only be danced by its Community of Origin, which is Krama

Pemaksan Pura Dhang Kahyangan Taman Pule Desa Adat Mas. While the other one, the “Open” TCEs means those works can be used commercially such as to be performed to support business activities (Ibid).

In Indonesia, TCEs work can also be classified as copyright. The arrangements can be found in Article 38 of Law 28/2014. Both Law 28/2014 and Government Regulation 56/2022 specify that the right on TCEs work held by the State and the State obliges to conduct the inventory, maintain and preserve the works. Though the right is held by the State, according to Article 5 (1) of the Government Regulation 56/2022, the right on Communal IP, in this case including TCEs, is an inclusive moral right, which is supported and/or carried out by the Community of Origin, which has economic benefits, and is valid indefinitely. It can be seen that intellectual works contain economic value thus beneficial to society (Setiawan and Samsithawrati, 2023). Therefore, in the context of Communal IP, the benefit-sharing mechanism is needed once the work is used commercially by people outside the Community of Origin or by others turning such work into personal work for commercial purpose as it contains economic benefit. Unfortunately, none of the Laws and Regulations on IP areas regulate this benefit-sharing mechanism. However, at least the issue related to the regulation of the benefit-sharing mechanism has been briefly discussed in Law Number 5 of 2017 on the Advancement of Culture (hereinafter referred to as Law 5/2017). In this context, the types of works of TCEs as stipulated in the regulations concerning Communal IP must be adapted to the Objects for the Advancement of Culture as stipulated in Article 5 Law 5/2017 so that the benefit-sharing mechanism can be applied. For example, communal dances which define as TCEs in the form of “movement” in Communal IP are included in the category of “performing arts” in Article 5 (g) Law 5/2017. Law 5/2017, through Article 37, only mentions that benefit-sharing should be obtained by large industries and/or foreigners who will commercially use the Objects for the Advancement of Culture. Hence, it leaves room for uncertainty as to what extent the parties should proceed with the benefit-sharing mechanism, how much is the percentage of the benefit-sharing for each party, and what if those who are going to use it commercially are not large industry and/or foreigners. All in all, the Indonesian government needs to do extra work to regulate this in a clearer picture as this is important and beneficial for all involved parties. This is where government needs to collaborate with the academicians as well as the Community of Origin and other stakeholders so that all aspirations on benefit-sharing can be accommodated.

3.2 The Suitable Digital Management Model to Strengthen the Protection of Traditional Cultural Expressions Works as Part of Communal Intellectual Property

Indonesia, including Bali, is very rich in Communal IP works. Though there are a lot of success stories in the inventory of such works, still a lot has not been fully inventoried. Even though those Communal IP works have been inventoried and have a certificate as recording proof the Community of Origin does not yet fully receive the benefit, in the context of benefit-sharing, of the commercialization of such works through the creation of individual intellectual property works like photo or video created by

other people of the Communal IP works. Benefit-sharing is important in this case bearing in mind that the works of the Community of Origin have been preserved and developed for generations from generation to generation in today's modern era. However, aside from the benefit-sharing concept itself, the Community of Origin shall also start to build its own Communal IP empire by empowering and strengthening its community through the utilization of digital management. As Arthur Schopenhauer said, change alone is eternal, perpetual immortal (The Burnt Branch). Thus, for the Community of Origin to survive with its Communal IP works and obtain economic benefits amidst the onslaught of the times, it must also maximize the use of the digital world.

Before moving forward to the concept of suitable digital management to strengthen the protection of TCEs works as part of Communal IP, it is still considered important to take a look at the benefit-sharing concept. What is meant by benefit-sharing, including benefit-sharing which can bring a sense of "fair and equitable" itself is actually still being widely discussed by various experts. One of the examples, Schroeder (2007) in Jonge (2011) argued fair and equitable benefit-sharing, at some point, can be looked at as a compensation mechanism or fair compensation where each party provides one thing and receives another, focusing on an equal exchange. So far, benefit-sharing protection is a solution in order to provide legal certainty and justice for the Community of Origin, related to Communal IP that is used commercially by parties outside the Community of Origin to become the other's work of personal IP. Benefit-sharing-based protection is urgently needed to be fought for as a responsive effort to the important note mandated by the World Trade Organization Council for Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights, IP/C/370/Rev.1 regarding the protection of Communal IP, namely in the event that benefit-sharing has not been regulated in international agreements on IP so that its regulation is maximized through the IP legal system of member countries and the sui generis protection system. Willcox et al (2015) even argued that though the knowledge is not owned by a clearly identified group or person, benefit-sharing and respect for IP rights are possible. Imagine, it would even be easier for the Communal IP works which are clearly inventoried and recorded, the benefit-sharing mechanism as a form of respecting IP is possible and important to be done.

In Indonesia, unfortunately, there are currently no laws and regulations in the field of IP that regulate this benefit-sharing concept. Therefore, there is no clear mechanism for such a benefit-sharing concept regulated under the IP regime laws and regulations. However, at least as a sufficient good start, although not under the umbrella of IP laws and regulations, the regulation regarding benefit-sharing can be briefly seen in the law that regulates the promotion of culture (Law 5/2017). This law regarding the promotion of culture provides protection to objects for the advancement of culture (Article 5). However, upon further examination, it can be interpreted that in several respects, the Object for the Advancement of Culture is actually a type of TCEs. Thus as already mentioned in the previous sub-chapter, at least just for now, the benefit-sharing mechanism on TCEs can refer to Law 5/2017, specifically Article 37, although in the long-term context, it is the laws and regulations in the field of IP that

must later regulate this subject matter in more detail to provide more legal certainty for the parties.

The example of this uploading practice of Communal IP documentation to social media by other people has a detrimental impact on custodians who have such Communal IP as their source is used as a personal creation. Facing such a phenomenon, a relevant model for strengthening Communal IP is through a hybrid mechanism. First, it needs a recording certificate. Second, the custodial community needs to empower communal intellectual property digital management by having official social media accounts as a vehicle for information and announcing their work internationally. The hybrid mechanism referred to in this context is that it does not stop at the mechanism for inventorying and recording Communal IP works as mandated both in Ministry of Law and Human Rights Regulation 13/2017 and Government Regulation 56/2022, but also in combination with the development of a mechanism based on the Own Communal Intellectual Property Digital Management concept. In the context of today's digital era, the development and ownership of official social media accounts have a very important role in increasing the protection of IP ownership both related to Moral Rights and Economic Rights. The music and song creative industry which is in the realm of personal Copyright protection has transformed into a digital world. Through the ownership of personal channels on social media such as YouTube and other digital platforms, this media functions as a means for transformation, namely copyrighted works of video, music and uploads to digital media, and the creators receive economic benefits in the form of royalties for their works which are commercialized either by the creators or copyright holders themselves or by other parties with permission. Such a mechanism can be categorized as a model for the development of Intellectual Property Digital Management. Presumably, this model is also relevant to be applied in the context of developing and strengthening the protection of TCEs as a type of Communal IP.

The existence of TCEs works in tourism areas such as Bali, on the one hand greatly supports world tourism destinations. However, on the other hand, it is also vulnerable to the threat of commercialization through digital media, namely TCEs works that are in the communal realm are transformed into personal video works and uploaded as films in digital media for commercial purposes. The Cak Bona dance from Gianyar-Bali is an example. The performance of this work has been published digitally both in video and photo form by non-Community of Origin. Therefore, the Community of Origin has lost the opportunity to gain economic benefits as a form of Communal IP protection for works that they inherit, develop, and preserve across generations. Facing the challenges of digital commercialization like that of Communal IP' works, the role and presence of the state are very important. Protection should be strengthened. Lessons learned from those who take advantage of digital management in obtaining economic benefits for the personal works they own. It is important that this model is adopted and transformed into the protection of Communal IP works. In this context, it is important for Communities of Origin who carry TCEs works that have the potential to support their creative economy to manage their work with digital-based management. One of the models is that they have an official account on various social media platforms to socialize, announce, and publish the progress of their TCEs works peri-

odically through video, short film documentation, and photograph uploads. Content can be explored creatively starting from history, social, cultural, and economic functions, as well as the philosophy of the existence of communal works that they carry and preserve. In the framework of professional digital-based creative content, it is important for the presence of the government through the facilitation of collaboration with various stakeholders, especially with regard to professional creative digital content. The various variants of Digital Management Intellectual Property are also important after having a personal account basis for the media to communicate TCEs-based creative works. It is also important to be combined with protection-based in the Collective Management Organization context, especially for withdrawing royalties in the context of the commercialization of the converting TCEs works into personal works by their owners.

4 Conclusion

Protection of TCEs as a form of Communal IP is explicitly regulated through the Law 28/2014, Ministry of Law and Human Rights Regulation 13/2017, as well as Government Regulation 56/2022 which basically regulates inventory-based protection and recording, are the obligations of the government. The government is considered the owner of TCEs carried by the Community of Origin. Strengthening protection using a hybrid mechanism, namely combining inventory and recording-based protection with the Digital Management Intellectual Property mechanism. It is expected that there will be an increment in the protection for communal IP works that are transformed into personal works, especially protection related to benefit-sharing. Periodic uploads in various social media platforms of a Community of Origin's creative contents, including its Communal IP works, are intended to be continuously conducted as this strengthens Communal IP works ownership carried out by the Community of Origin. Therefore, if there are other parties outside the Community of Origin who commercialize TCEs works either through transformation or in other ways and forms, it is appropriate for those who receive economic benefits from the work of others to provide benefit-sharing as a form of protection for the existence of Communal IP works carried out by the Community of Origin.

REFERENCES

1. Alvendo Wahyu Aranski and Sestri Novia Rizki. 2018. Pemrograman Visual Basic Pendeteksi Dini Kecanduan Penggunaan Smartphone Terhadap Produktivitas Kerja Menggunakan Logika Fuzzy. *Seminar Nasional Ilmu Sosial dan Teknologi* 1, 23 August 2018: 13-18.
2. Anggri Widia Rahma Minniarni, Dedy Novriadi, and Selly Sepika. 2022. Edukasi Pemakaian Smartphone Sebagai Media Penghasil Uang Pada Remaja di Desa Muara Kallangan Kecamatan Ulu Musi Kabupaten Empat Lawang. *Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa Kuliah Kerja Nyata*, Vol. 2, No. 1: 137-142. <https://doi.org/10.36085/jimakukerta.v2i1.3386>

3. Bin Liu. 2023. Research on Intellectual Property Right Protection of Genetic Resources in China under Benefit-Sharing. *Biotechnolgy Law Report*, Vol. 42 No. 2. <https://doi.org/10.1089/blr.2023.29301.bl>
4. Bram De Jonge. 2011. What is Fair and Equitable Benefit-Sharing?. *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics*. 24:127-146.
5. Desak Putu Dewi Kasih, Ni Ketut Supasti Dharmawan, Anak Agung Istri Ari Atu Dewi, I Gusti Ngurah Parikesit Widiatedja, Anak Agung Gede Duwira Hadi Santosa, and Putu Aras Samsithawrati. January 2023. *Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Business Law and Local Wisdom in Tourism (ICBLT 2022) in Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*: 226-234. https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-494069-93-0_27
6. Desak Putu Dewi Kasih, Ni Ketut Supasti Dharmawan, Putu Aras Samsithawrati, Putri Triari Dwijayanthi, Dewa Ayu Dian Sawitri, A.A. Istri Eka Krisna Yanti. 2023. Policies Concerning Sacred and Open Traditional Cultural Expressions: Tourism and Creative Economy in Bali Context. *Jurnal Jatiswara*, Vol. 38, No. 1: 14-27. <https://doi.org/10.29303/jtsw.v38i1.475>
7. Devdan. <https://www.devdanshow.com/en/act-show-bali.php>. Accessed on 7 August 2023.
8. Fachrizal Afandi. 2022. Penelitian Hukum Interdisipliner Reza Banakar: Urgensi dan Desain Penelitian Sosio-legal. *Undang: Jurnal Hukum*, Vol. 5 No. 1: 231-255. <https://doi.org/10.22437/ujh.5.1.231-255>
9. I.B. Deva Harista Setiawan and Putu Aras Samsithawrati. 2023. Legal Protection Toward Balinese Arak as Intangible Cultural Heritage. *Jurnal Magister Hukum Udayana (Udayana Master Law Journal)*, Vol. 12, No. 2: 270-281. <https://doi.org/10.24843/JMHU.2023.v12.i02.p04>
10. I Gusti Bagus Rai Utama, Christian Tonyjanto, Ni Putu Dyah Krismawintari, Dermawan Waruwu, Ni Nyoman Tri Sukarsih, I Nengah Suardhana. 2023. Exploration of the Advantages of Tourism Branding In Bali, Indonesia. *International Journal of Professional Business Review*, Vol. 8 No. 3: 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.26668/businessreview/2023.v8i3.1609>
11. Jay Dratler, Jr. *Intellectual Property Law: Commercial, Creative, and Industrial Property*. New York: Law Journal Press. 2006.
12. Karly Ann Burch, Dawn Nafus, Katharine Legun. Laurens Klerkx. 2023. Intellectual Property Meets Transdisciplinary Co-Design: Prioritizing Responsiveness in The Production of New Agtech Through Located Response-Ability. *Agriculture and Human Values* 40: 455-474. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10460-022-10378-3>
13. Merlin Willcox, Drissa Diallo, Rokia Sanogo, Sergio Giani, Bertrand Graz, Jacques Falquet, and Gerard Bodeket. 2015. Intellectual Property Rights, Benefit-Sharing And Development Of "Improved Traditional Medicines": A New Approach. *Journal of Ethnopharmacology*, Vol. 176: 281-285. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jep.2015.10.041>
14. Ni Ketut Supasti Dharmawan, Putu Aras Samsithawrati, Desak Putu Dewi Kasih, Putri Triari Dwijayanti, and I Gede Agus Kurniawan. 2023. Model Penguatan Perlindungan Kekayaan Intelektual Komunal: Tranplantasi Muatan Kebijakan Termasuk Benefit-Sharing Berbasis Undang-Undang. *Jurnal Ilmiah Kebijakan Hukum*, Vol. 17 No.2: 235-252. <http://dx.doi.org/10.30641/kebijakan.2023.V17.235-252>
15. Purnama Hadi Kusuma and Kholis Roisah. 2022. Perlindungan Ekspresi Budaya Tradisional Dan Indikasi Geografis: Suatu Kekayaan Intelektual Dengan Kepemilikan Komunal. *Jurnal Pembangunan Hukum Indonesia*, Vol. 4 No. 1: 107-120. <https://doi.org/10.14710/jphi.v4i1.107-120>

16. Putu Aras Samsithawrati, Ni Ketut Supasti Dharmawan, Putri Triari Dwijyanthi, Anak Agung Istri Eka Krisnayanti, Dewa Ayu Dian Sawitri. 2023. Perlindungan Hukum Seni Menghidangkan Makanan dan Karya Turunannya Berbasis Teknologi: Perspektif Hak Cipta. *Jurnal Analisis Hukum*, Vol. 6 No. 1: 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.38043/jah.v6i1.4159>
17. Taufik H. Simatupang. 2021. Hak Asasi Manusia dan Perlindungan Kekayaan Intelektual dalam Perspektif Negara Hukum (Sebuah Pandangan Teoritik) (Human Rights And Protection of Intellectual Property in the Perspective of State Law (A Theoretical View)). *Jurnal HAM*, Vol. 12 No. 1: 111-122. <http://dx.doi.org/10.30641/ham.2021.12.111-122>
18. The Burnt Branch. <https://www.theburntbranch.com/products/arthur-schopenhauer-floating-quote-change-alone-is-eternal-perpetual-immortal-progress-adaptation-personal-development-innovation>. Accessed on 10 August 2023.
19. Wandernesia. *Bali Devdan Show*. <https://www.wandernesia.com/product/devdan-show/>. Accessed on 7 August 2023.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

