



Between Protection and Commodification: Geographical Indication, Intellectual Property Paradox, and Cultural Preservation of *Batik Tulis Lasem*

Kholis Roisah¹, Nazura Abdul Manap², Shofiy Zulfah³,
Moh. Asadullah Hasan Al Asy'arie⁴, Sung-Seung Yun⁵

^{1,3,4} Universitas Diponegoro, Semarang, Indonesia

² Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Bangi, Malaysia

⁵ Ajou University, Suwon, Republic of Korea

Keywords

Batik Tulis Lasem;
Commodification;
Cultural Heritage
Protection; Geographical
Indication; Traditional
Cultural Expression

DOI

<https://doi.org/10.24843/UJLC.2026.v10.i02.p02>

Author E-mail

¹kholisroisah.fh.undip@gmail.com

²nazura@ukm.edu.my

³ **Correspondence:**
shofiyzulfah@live.undip.ac.id

⁴

asadullah@lecturer.undip.ac.id

⁵ssyun@ajou.ac.kr

This is an Open Access article,
distributed under the terms of the
Creative Commons Attribution
license
(<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).



Abstract

Batik Tulis Lasem is a textile tradition shaped by centuries of interaction between Javanese and Chinese cultures, as evidenced by its distinctive motifs, colours, and production techniques. As a Geographical Indication (GI), the recent designation of Batik Tulis Lasem situates this heritage within a formal legal framework that aims to protect authenticity and enhance economic value. This study analyses the practical operation of GI protection and critically assesses mechanisms intended to preserve tradition that may also drive commodification. Employing a normative juridical approach, the research integrates statutory, conceptual, and comparative analyses, with particular reference to regulatory experiences in India, Korea, and Malaysia. The findings indicate that GI status enhances reputation, consumer trust, and market access, but also formalises boundaries regarding legitimate production and marketing of Batik Tulis Lasem. In the absence of effective governance, supervision, and community participation, such exclusivity may lead to disputes, imitation, and pressures toward mass production. The long-term sustainability of Batik Tulis Lasem thus relies on balancing legal protection, cultural continuity, and adaptive innovation.

1. INTRODUCTION

The term "Batik" originates from the Javanese language and refers to the process of painting, drawing, or designing on textiles using wax.¹ It is a

¹ See Gertrude Clayton Lewis, *First Lesson in Batik: A Handbook in Batik, Tie-Dyeing and All Pattern Dyeing* (New York: The Prang Company, 1922), 7

textile produced through traditional methods using the wax-resist dyeing technique (*celup rintang*), in which melted wax functions as a colour resist.² A textile may therefore be classified as *batik* when it incorporates this essential wax-resist element.³ The decorative motifs of *batik* embody profound meanings, reflecting the cultural and spiritual beliefs of the community, and frequently draw inspiration from nature, mythology, local customs, folklore, and historical events.⁴ *Batik* thus serves as a symbol of cultural identity and heritage. Its motifs are frequently the result of the acculturation of diverse cultural influences.⁵

Batik Tulis Lasem is an example of a batik type originating from and preserved by the local artisan community in Lasem, Rembang Regency, Central Java Province, Indonesia. It incorporates elements of both Chinese and Javanese cultures, producing motifs that are distinctive and rich in meaning.⁶

Batik tulis refers to the Indonesian hand-drawn batik technique in which artisans use a *canting* to apply hot wax by hand, tracing intricate motifs directly onto the fabric before dyeing.⁷ The art of *batik tulis*, as an intellectual creativity rooted in Traditional Cultural Expression (TCE), reflects Indonesia's rich and diverse indigenous cultural heritage. Its patterns and colours are shaped by geography, social structure, and cross-cultural interaction.

Indonesian *batik* was officially recognised by the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) as a Masterpiece of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity in 2009.⁸ As a TCE, *batik tulis* is protected as Communal Intellectual Property (CIP) under Law No. 28 of 2014 on Copyright (Law 28/2014), as implemented by Government Regulation No. 56 of 2022 on CIP (Government Regulation 56/2022), and additionally regulated under Law No. 5 of 2017 on Cultural Advancement (Law 5/2017) from a heritage-preservation perspective.⁹ These frameworks adopt an inclusive approach — the use of *batik* is generally

² Santoso Doellah, *Batik Pengaruh Zaman dan Lingkungannya* (Penerbit Danar Hadi, 2002): 2.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ Agus Eko Minarno, Indah Soesanti, and Hanung Adi Nugroho, "Dataset of Batik Nitik Sarimbit 120," *Data in Brief* 55 (2024): 2.

⁵ Mary Celica Susantio and Rachmi Kumala Widyasari, "The Influence of Peranakan Culture on the Typology of the Kidang Mas Batik House, Lasem," *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science* 1169 (2023): 2.

⁶ Vera Jenny Basiroen and Ida Bagus Kerthyayana Manuaba, "The Cultural Aspect of Javanese and Chinese Acculturation in Lasem," *Humaniora: Journal of Indonesian Culture and Society* 13, no. 2 (2022): 94.

⁷ Vera Jenny Basiroen, Grasheli Kusuma Andhini, and Ida Bagus Kerthyayana Manuaba, "Preserving Tradition: Motif Design Development for Batik Tulis Lasem," *IAFOR Journal of Cultural Studies* 10, no. 1 (2025): 271.

⁸ Puspita Ayu Permatasari and Lorenzo Cantoni, "Indonesian Tourism and Batik: An Online Map," *E-Review of Tourism Research* 16, no. 2–3 (2019): 185.

⁹ Fadjar Ramdhani Setyawan, Sudarsono, and Yuliati, "Inconsistency of the Concept of Legal Protection of Traditional Cultural Expressions with Theory of Legal Ideals," *De Jure: Jurnal Hukum dan Syar'iah* 13, no. 1 (2021): 127.

permitted without state authorisation, provided that it does not contradict local wisdom or serve commercial purposes. Commercial use, however, is subject to benefit-sharing obligations. Despite this, the framework has not been sufficiently effective in ensuring that local communities benefit from commercialisation or that *batik* remains practised within its traditional cultural context.

Batik artworks are further recognised under copyright law as CIPs,¹⁰ while individual modifications may separately qualify for copyright protection.¹¹ Traditional *batik* ornamentation may also be registered as a Geographical Indication (GI) under Law No. 20 of 2016 on Trademark and Geographical Indication (Law 20/2016), implementing Article 22 of the Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights Agreement (TRIPs Agreement). This protection applies to goods whose quality, reputation, or characteristics are essentially attributable to their geographical origin.¹² Uniquely among CIP categories, GI rights are held collectively rather than individually, guaranteeing holders the exclusive right to authorise or prohibit use so long as the underlying reputation and characteristics persist.¹³ *Batik Tulis Lasem* exemplifies this GI mechanism in practice. It was officially registered as a Geographical Indication with Indonesia's Directorate General of Intellectual Property (DGIP) in 2023, as recorded in the national Intellectual Property Database (*Pangkalan Data Kekayaan Intelektual* or PDKI).¹⁴ In this context, GI registration transforms a collective cultural expression into territorially bounded communal property with exclusive rights.

This exclusivity, however, generates a paradox between protectionism and cultural inclusivity. On one hand, GI prevents unlawful appropriation, secures economic value through collective reputation, and fulfils Indonesia's obligations under the 2003 UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (2003 UNESCO Convention).¹⁵ On the other hand, it may marginalise individual artisans outside its parameters, given that *Batik Tulis Lasem* is a product of dynamic and cross-generational acculturation. The economic stakes are then considerable: GI certification

¹⁰ Setiyono et al., "Has Indonesia Safeguarded Traditional Cultural Expressions?," *Jambura Law Review* 6, no. 2 (2024): 207.

¹¹ See Komarudin Kudiya and Saftiyaningsih Ken Atik, "The Importance of the Governor Regulation in Supporting the Geographical Indication of Batik Production in West Java," *Jurnal Media Hukum* 27, no. 1 (2020): 122; and Law 20/2016, Art. 1(6).

¹² See Delphine Marie-Vivien, "Do Geographical Indications for Handicrafts Deserve a Special Regime? Insights from Worldwide Law and Practice," In *Ius Gentium: Comparative Perspectives on Law and Justice* (IUSGENT 58), ed. William van Caenegem and Jen Cleary. (Cham: Springer 2017), 231; and Rahmi Jened, Agus Sujatmiko, and Bunga N Indah Sari, "Strategy in Developing a Community Model and Preparing a Specification Book of Geographical Indication Protection for Tropical Apple Variety of Batu City, East Java Province," *NTUT Journal of Intellectual Property Law and Management* 13, no. 2 (2024): 53.

¹³ Marie-Vivien, *op. cit.*, 232.

¹⁴ Geographical Indication No. for *Batik Tulis Lasem* is ID G 000000116, Application No. E-IG.09.2023.000004. See "Batik Tulis Lasem", *Pangkalan Data Kekayaan Intelektual*, accessed July 27, 2026, <https://pdki-indonesia.dgip.go.id/detail/e3b0c44298fc1c149afb4c8996fb92427ae41e4649b934ca495991b7852b855>.

¹⁵ 2003 UNESCO Convention, Arts. 11 and 13(d).

reportedly raised the selling price of *Batik Tulis Nitik Yogyakarta* by 10–50%,¹⁶ consistent with findings that GI-certified products command significant price premiums.¹⁷ In a social and cultural context, this exclusivity also risks crystallising an official narrative of “authenticity” that overlooks subcultural diversity and reduces batik’s symbolic meaning to a commercial attribute, in tension with Javanese philosophical traditions that regard batik as a spiritual medium.

This article adopts a normative juridical methodology, utilising a doctrinal legal approach to examine the relationship between statutory regulations governing CIP rights, GIs, and the use of cultural expressions. This analysis combines theoretical studies on TCEs, including the concept of commodification, with an evaluation of relevant legal principles and intellectual property (IP) doctrines within both national and international legal systems. Additionally, a comparative legal approach is applied by analysing the relevant legal frameworks of Malaysia, Korea, and India.

The selection of these three jurisdictions rests on two rationales. First, Malaysia and South Korea were selected based on structural and cultural proximity to Indonesia. Malaysia shares Indonesia's Malay cultural lineage (*rumpun budaya*), a proximity that has historically produced cross-border disputes over shared traditional cultural expressions, so examining its regulatory framework offers insight into mechanisms that may prevent similar conflicts.¹⁸ South Korea, meanwhile, was selected because, like the primary subject, it shares civil law tradition and actively preserves its living cultural heritage practices, making it a methodologically ideal case for a most-similar-systems comparison.¹⁹ India, by contrast, was selected for its regulatory maturity: despite its common law tradition, India's Geographical Indications of Goods (Registration and Protection) Act 1999 and its 2002 Rules represent one of the more comprehensive GI frameworks globally, offering a best-practice benchmark against which Indonesia's regulatory framework may be evaluated.

Prior scholarly attention has focused on GI protection in Indonesia and its intersection with CIP. Harding et al. (2025) conducted a comprehensive review of GI-registered products in Indonesia, focusing on their spatial distribution and classification.²⁰ However, their analysis remains descriptive

¹⁶ Deslaely Putranti and Dewi Analisis Indriyani, “Perlindungan Indikasi Geografis oleh Masyarakat Perlindungan Indikasi Geografis Pasca Sertifikasi di Yogyakarta,” *Jurnal Ilmiah Kebijakan Hukum* 15, no. 3 (2021): 402.

¹⁷ “GIs The ‘Darling’ of Europe, But Protection a Challenge for All, Producers Say,” Catherine Saez, accessed June 19, 2026, <https://www.ip-watch.org/2013/05/28/gis-the-darling-of-europe-but-protection-a-challenge-for-all-producers-say/>.

¹⁸ Meng Yew Lai and Yusten Karulus, “The Indonesia-Malaysia Cultural Heritage Disputes: A Case Study of the Pendet Dance and Rasa Sayange Folk Song,” *MANU: Jurnal Pusat Penataran Ilmu dan Bahasa* 29 (2019): 145.

¹⁹ “South Korea Litigation & Dispute Resolution Comparative Guide”, Mondaq, accessed July 20, 2026, <https://www.mondaq.com/guides/results/28/1113/all/south-korea-litigation-dispute-resolution>.

²⁰ Diana Harding et al., “Geographical Indication in Indonesia: A Review on the Spatial Distribution and Classification of Geographical Indication-Registered Products and -Related Publications,” *The Journal of World Intellectual Property* 28, no. 1 (2025): 274.

in scope. It does not examine the normative tensions inherent in GI exclusivity, particularly the paradox between legal protectionism and cultural inclusivity as it manifests in TCE-based products such as *batik*. Similarly, Sreenath and Jose (2023) offered valuable insights into how Indonesian and Indian GI regimes align structurally, their bilateral focus excludes significant jurisdictions such as South Korea and Malaysia. Moreover, their study overlooks the commodification pressures that GI designation may simultaneously generate for culturally embedded textile traditions.²¹ In the domain of CIP, Palar et al. (2023) examined the concept of inclusive rights under Indonesia's Government Regulation on CIP, providing a foundational framework for understanding collective ownership.²² Nonetheless, their analysis does not interrogate the dynamic tension between cultural inclusivity and GI-based exclusivity as applied to a specific TCE product shaped by cross-cultural acculturation.

Against this backdrop, the present study seeks to fill these intersecting gaps through a case study of *Batik Tulis Lasem*. Based on the above explanation, this study addresses the following research questions: (1) how does the protection of *Batik Tulis Lasem* reveal a paradox between intellectual property regimes and the preservation of Traditional Cultural Expression?; (2) what is the legal status of *Lasem* hand-drawn *batik* (*Batik Tulis Lasem*) as a Geographical Indication product recently registered in 2023?; and (3) how can the comparative legal frameworks of India, South Korea, and Malaysia inform strategies to address the commodification challenges posed by Geographical Indication protection of such culturally embedded textile traditions?

2. RESULT AND ANALYSIS

2.1. Protection of *Batik Tulis Lasem*: The Paradox Between Intellectual Property and Cultural Heritage

2.1.1. Traditional Cultural Expression and the Need for Legal Protections

The creativity embodied in *batik* textiles, as a form of TCE, serves as a cultural marker central to the identity of nations and ethnic groups.²³ Since TCE transmits communal wisdom and values across generations,²⁴ and its

²¹ K.P. Sreenath and Anson Jose, "Geographical Indications and Traditional Cultural Expressions: A Comparative Legal Analysis of the GI Laws of Indonesia and India and a Case Study Analysis," *The Journal of World Intellectual Property* 26, no. 3 (2023): 341.

²² Miranda Risang Ayu Palar, Laina Rafianti, and Helitha Novianty Muchtar, "Inclusive Rights to Protect Communal Intellectual Property: Indonesian Perspective on Its New Government Regulation Inclusive Rights to Protect Communal Intellectual Property: Indonesian Perspective on Its New Government Regulation," *Cogent Social Sciences* 9, no. 2 (2023): 2.

²³ Yu Cheng and Sandeep Sikka, "Exploring Spiritual Continuity: The Du Jie Ceremony as a Manifestation of Religious Identity and Cultural Resilience among the Yao Ethnic Group in Hunan, China," *International Journal of Interdisciplinary Cultural Studies* 20, no. 1 (2024): 98.

²⁴ Adrian Viliami Bell and Anna Paegle, "Ethnic Markers and How to Find Them: An Ethnographic Investigation of Marker Presence, Recognition, and Social Information," *Human Nature* 32, no. 2 (2021): 473.

erosion threatens both cultural continuity and community wellbeing,²⁵ its protection requires a robust legal basis.

TCE protection is commonly pursued through IP law, securing moral rights (preventing distortion or misattribution) and economic rights (ensuring community benefit from exploitation), as well as cultural heritage law, which emphasises preservation and intergenerational continuity.²⁶ Under Government Regulation 56/2022, *batik* works are classified as CIP, granting the supporting community rights of attribution, integrity, and exclusive economic exploitation.²⁷

The protection of *batik* as a TCE under Indonesian law is implemented through both inclusive (open) and exclusive (closed) mechanisms. Inclusive mechanisms permit the TCE utilisation without requiring special authorisation,²⁸ whereas exclusive mechanisms require external parties to obtain prior consent from the owning community or authorisation from a competent authority before any use or exploitation may take place.²⁹ Exclusive protection is generally implemented for TCE that remains closely related to spiritual values and customary norms, with usage regulated by traditional provisions regarding time, place, purpose, and authorised users.³⁰ For instance, certain *batik* motifs within the palace environments of the Yogyakarta and Surakarta Sultanates, such as Parang and other sacred patterns, have historically been reserved for royalty and nobility.³¹

2.1.2. Communal Intellectual Property and the Inclusive-Exclusive Protection Mechanism

The exclusive protection mechanism aims to prevent the use of TCE in ways inconsistent with the traditions maintained and transmitted across generations by customary communities.³² When TCEs are used out of context, their sacred significance risks being diluted or lost entirely,

²⁵ Wahyuddin Sahabuddin and Andi Hildayanti, "Influence of Cosmology in Life and Architecture: Insights from the Kajang People of Indonesia," *ISVS E-Journal* 10, no. 6 (2023): 26.

²⁶ Ujang Suratno and Rahmanisa Purnamasari Faujura, "Effectiveness of Law Enforcement of National and International Instruments for the Protection of Traditional Cultural Expressions as Intangible Cultural Heritage in Indonesia," *Journal of Ecohumanism* 3, no. 7 (2024): 3378.

²⁷ See Government Regulation 56/2022, Art. 4; and Ni Ketut Supasti Dharmawan et al., "Quo Vadis Traditional Cultural Expressions Protection: Threats from Personal Intellectual Property and Artificial Intelligence," *Law Reform: Jurnal Pembaharuan Hukum* 19, no. 2 (2023): 333.

²⁸ Xiaoli Li, Mohd Andari Mohd Khair, and Wei Ying, "Exploration of Copyright Law Safeguards for Traditional Cultural Expressions (TCEs)," *International Journal of Criminal Justice Sciences* 19, no. 1 (2024): 119.

²⁹ Anil Gupta, "Traditional Cultural Expressions: Analysis of Culinary Custom," *Journal of Intellectual Property Rights* 27, no. 1 (2022): 55.

³⁰ Dwi Wulan Titik Andari et al., "Local Wisdom in the Land System of Manggarai's Indigenous People, Indonesia," *ISVS E-Journal* 10, no. 9 (2023): 224.

³¹ "Motif Batik Larangan Keraton Yogyakarta," Kraton Ngayogyakarta Hadiningrat, accessed February 12, 2026, <https://www.kratonjogja.id/kagungan-dalem/12-motif-batik-larangan-keraton-yogyakarta/>.

³² Suratno and Faujura, *op. cit.*, 4.

ultimately harming the communities that sustain them.³³ Furthermore, exclusive protection may also be implemented for TCEs that lie outside the occupation of customary communities or have entered the public domain, provided that the supporting community submits a registration of the distinctive characteristics of such TCEs to the DGIP, for instance, through a Geographical Indication or Collective Mark scheme.³⁴

Closed protection operates on the principle of Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC), the right of customary communities to receive prior information and grant or withhold consent regarding external use of TCE.^{35,36} In the Indonesian context, this is anchored in Article 18B(2) of the 1945 Constitution and operationalised through Article 38 of Law 28/2014.³⁷ Inclusive protection, by contrast, requires no such authorisation.³⁸

This creates a core paradox: IP protection inherently reframes communally held TCEs as exclusive economic assets, subjecting them to market-driven pressures toward commodification. This applies equally to both the CIP and GI regimes described earlier. Cultural heritage law, by contrast, is oriented toward preserving the very authenticity and spiritual integrity that such commodification risks eroding. Batik Tulis Lasem sits squarely within this unresolved tension: its 2023 GI registration formalizes the community's craft as a marketable, exclusive asset. This status risks recasting Lasem's Sino-Javanese customary meaning in commercial rather than communal terms. The legal status and implications of such registration are examined in the following section.

2.2. Legal Status and Implications of *Batik Tulis Lasem* as a Geographical Indication Product

2.2.1. The Legal Status of *Batik Tulis Lasem* as a Registered Geographical Indication

The textile tradition and ornamental motifs of *Batik Tulis Lasem* are inseparable from historical interactions among Javanese, Arab, Chinese, and European cultures, collectively producing the coastal *batik* tradition known as *Batik Pesisiran*, centered in cities such as Cirebon, Pekalongan, Lasem, and Surabaya. *Batik Tulis Lasem* is distinguished by its integration of Chinese and Javanese elements, traced to the arrival of Admiral Cheng

³³ Ariel J Mosley et al., "Perceptions of Harm and Benefit Predict Judgments of Cultural Appropriation," *Social Psychological and Personality Science* 15, no. 3 (2024): 304.

³⁴ Kholis Roisah et al., "Empowering Cultural Communities In Protecting Traditional Expressions: Legal Challenges In The Digital Age," *Diponegoro Law Review* 10, no. 2 (2025): 141.

³⁵ Laurence Klein, María Jesús Muñoz-Torres, and María Ángeles Fernández-Izquierdo, "Free, Prior, and Informed Consent," *International Journal on Minority and Group Rights* 31, no. 5 (2024): 10.

³⁶ Isfaq Hussain Malik, "Principles for ethical research in the Himalayas: Decolonising research ethics across the disciplines," *Humanities Social Sciences Communications* 13, no. 168 (2026): 6.

³⁷ Aparna Sajeev et al., "Protection of Ritualistic Performances and Challenges of Copyright Law in the Digital World: A Case Study of Theyyam" - AIP Conference Proceedings: 3.

³⁸ Enyinna Nwauche, *The Protection of Traditional Cultural Expressions in Africa* (Springer International Publishing, 2017): 82.

Ho³⁹ at the port of Binangun in 1413, which is widely believed to have introduced Chinese motifs and colour symbolism into its design.⁴⁰ It is further renowned for its bold colour palette, particularly the iconic red known as *getih pitik* (chicken-blood red), symbolising vitality and Chinese cultural influence, alongside blue and brown hues that constitute an integral component of its cultural and artistic identity.⁴¹ Examples of *Batik Tulis Lasem* are presented in Figures 1 and 2 below.



Figure 1: *Getih Pithik*⁴²



Figure 2: *Batik Lasem Burung Hong*⁴³

³⁹ Admiral Cheng Ho, also known as Zheng He, was a Chinese Muslim admiral, diplomat, and explorer of the Ming dynasty who led seven major maritime expeditions across Southeast Asia, South Asia, the Middle East, and East Africa between 1405 and 1433 under the patronage of the Yongle Emperor. See Hum Sin Hoon, *Zheng He's Art of Collaboration: Understanding the Legendary Chinese Admiral from a Management Perspective* (Singapore: ISEAS Publishing, 2012), 6.

⁴⁰ Vera Jenny Basiroen, "Creating Batik Lasem through a Comparative Study of Batik Lasem and Champa in the 15th to 19th Century," *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, 729 (2021): 2.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*

⁴² Basiroen and Manuaba, *op.cit.*, 95.

⁴³ "Batik Lasem Burung Hong", Pinterest, accessed June 19, 2026, <https://pin.it/5AKPHkUz6>.

GI is among the most relevant legal protection mechanisms for *Batik Tulis Lasem*, given its distinctive characteristics intrinsically linked to the region's historical and cultural context. GI protection grants exclusive rights to producers within the designated geographical area to use the protected name – preventing external misappropriation and ensuring product authenticity.⁴⁴ GIs also contribute to TCEs preservation by linking products to their geographical origin⁴⁵ and distinctive production methods, thereby maintaining the integrity of regional cultural heritage.⁴⁶ This contribution, however, operates indirectly through the GI regime: *Batik Tulis Lasem* itself has not been separately inventoried or registered as TCEs within the CIP data system administered by the DGIP, despite having been designated Indonesian Intangible Cultural Heritage (*Warisan Budaya Takbenda Indonesia*) by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology.

The registration of *Batik Tulis Lasem* as a GI is governed by Law 20/2016. Its geographical origin is identified as Rembang Regency, particularly Lasem District and surrounding areas including Pancur, Sluke, Pamotan, Bulu, and Sulang. Moreover, *Batik Tulis Lasem* blends Chinese influence – evident in its motifs and symbolic elements, with Javanese culture, which inspires its philosophical meanings and traditional soga colouring. Known as *Batik Tiga Negeri* (literally "Three-Realm Batik") for its three dominant colours: red, blue, and soga, it features signature motifs like *Latohan*⁴⁷, *Gunung Ringgit*⁴⁸, and *Kendoro Kendiri*⁴⁹, produced using natural dyes and a particularly complex dyeing technique for its characteristic red. Legally protected as a GI, applied for on July 25, 2023, and granted on October 31, 2023, the "*Batik Tulis Lasem*" name is restricted to registered artisans under the Rembang Regency MPIG, who adhere to strict production standards.⁵⁰ This recognition enhances market image, stimulates design

⁴⁴ Emilie Vandecandelaere et al., "Introduction, A Worldwide Perspective of Geographical Indications in a Time of Changes: Crossed Views Between Researchers, Policy Makers and Practitioners" In *Worldwide Perspectives on Geographical Indications*, edited by Emilie Vandecandelaere et al (Cham: Springer, 2025): 6.

⁴⁵ Tamara Gajić et al., "Geographical Indications as Attractors for Rural Tourism: Insights from the Countryside of Serbia," *Geojournal of Tourism and Geosites* 59, no. 2 (2025): 857.

⁴⁶ Patricia Covarrubia, "The Disappearance of Traditions: The Use of Geographical Indications and Collective Marks to Prevent Loss of Culture in South America," *IIC International Review of Intellectual Property and Competition Law* 55, no. 8 (2024): 1272.

⁴⁷ *Latohan* takes its name from a type of edible sea plant (seaweed) found along the Lasem coast, and reflects the livelihood of the region's coastal community. See Basiroen, Andhini, and Manuaba, *op.cit.*, 283.

⁴⁸ *Gunung Ringgit* derives its name from "*gunung*" (mountain) and "*ringgit*" (an old silver currency) and is believed to symbolize hope for prosperity and abundant fortune for its wearer. See Vera Jenny Basiroen and Ida Bagus Kerthyayana Manuaba, "Batik Lasem Motifs Dataset: Gunung Ringgit, Kricak, Latohan, Nyuk Pitu, Seritan," *Data in Brief* 61 (2025): 23.

⁴⁹ *Kendoro Kendiri* is a motif that represents a pair of man and woman in a symmetrical relationship, derived from the Javanese term "*Kendono-Kendini*" meaning husband and wife. See Christine Claudia Lukman, Yunita Setyoningrum, and Sandy Rismantojo, "Revealing the Intangible Values in Lasem Batik Motif," *Journal of Arts and Humanities* 8, no. 9 (2019): 69.

⁵⁰ See Directorate General of Intellectual Property, "Berita Resmi Indikasi Geografis Seri-A, No. 019/IG/VII/A/2023",

innovation, supports local economic growth, and creates employment opportunities,⁵¹ while the GI label strengthens consumer perceptions of quality and authenticity by linking *Batik Tulis Lasem*'s distinctive patterns, colours, and production processes to its geographical origin.⁵² Protection is granted for an unlimited duration under Article 61 of Law 20/2016, provided the product's reputation and characteristics continue to comply with established specifications.

GI labelling on TCE-based products generates significant socio-economic impacts by attracting tourist interest and supporting community-based economic activities.⁵³ The communal nature of GI ownership ensures commercialisation produces collective rather than individual benefits, while its emphasis on traditional production methods and local knowledge promotes environmental sustainability and cultural resilience amid globalisation.⁵⁴

2.2.2. Comparative Legal Frameworks for Geographical Indication Protection of Traditional Textiles

GI protection for traditional textile crafts is also recognised in several other jurisdictions. In India, GI protection for traditional handicraft products, including traditional textiles, accounts for more than 55% of all registered GI products, followed by agricultural products (31%).⁵⁵ The legal framework governing GI protection in India is established under the Geographical Indications of Goods (Registration and Protection) Act, 1999 and the Geographical Indications of Goods (Registration and Protection) Rules, 2002. These legal instruments regulate key aspects of GIs for agricultural goods, natural products, manufactured goods, and

https://dgip.go.id/uploads/berita_resmi/file/6d045f8ca50fbec13339fe596919df99.pdf;
and "Batik Tulis Lasem", *loc.cit.*

⁵¹ Yosepin Sri Ningsih and Dwi Isma Aryani, "Fashion Design as a Method to Improve the Sustainability of Batik Lasem Industry - Sustainability in Creative Industries", *Sustainability in Creative Industries. SCI 2022. Advances in Science, Technology & Innovation* (2024): 40.

⁵² Alptekin Mert Yilmaz, Özge Can Niyaz Altinok, and Oktay Tomar, "Consumers' Purchasing Behaviors of Product with Geographical Indication: The Case of Ezine Cheese," *Journal of Tekirdag Agricultural Faculty* 22, no. 2 (2025): 286.

⁵³ See Renuka Devi and V Selvam, "Weaver Awareness and Perception of Geographical Indication Tags," *International Journal of Computational and Experimental Science and Engineering* 11, no. 1 (2025): 1041; and Fenny Wulandari et al., "Sui Generis System: GI Protection for the Herbal Product in Indonesia as Communal Property Right," *Cogent Social Sciences* 9, no. 1 (2023): 4.

⁵⁴ See Domenico Cristallo, "Geographical Indications and Biodiversity: An Overview of Regulatory Challenges and Critical Perspectives," *New Medit*, no. 3 (2025): 50; and Teng-Fei Ma, Chang-Wei Chai, and Tseng-Wei Chao, "On the Study of the Sustainable Development of Intangible Cultural Heritage of Indigenous Peoples' Diets, Take the Protection of Geographical Indications as an Example," *Sustainability* 14, no. 19 (2022): 12.

⁵⁵ Meghna Chaudhary, Bhawna Agarwal, and Meena Bhatia, "Geographical Indications in India: A Case of Handicraft Industry in Uttar Pradesh," *Journal of World Intellectual Property* 25, no. 3 (2022): 629.

handicrafts.⁵⁶ Specifically, they define GIs, outline registration procedures,⁵⁷ grant exclusive rights to registered producers,⁵⁸ protect against misuse and counterfeiting⁵⁹ as well as establish enforcement mechanisms and legal sanctions.⁶⁰ Several traditional textile crafts in India have been granted GI protection, including Banarasi Silk and Brocade from Varanasi, Kanchipuram Silk from Tamil Nadu, and *Pochampally Ikat* from Telangana, alongside other regionally significant textiles such as *Chanderi* fabric and Muga Silk from Assam. GI protection has contributed to increased market recognition and premium pricing while preventing unauthorised use and counterfeiting.⁶¹

In South Korea, GIs are protected under two legal frameworks: the 'Trademark Act' and the 'Agricultural and Fishery Products Quality Control Act'.⁶² Under the Trademark Act, protection is available through a GI collective mark, registered to an association of regional producers,⁶³ or a GI certification mark issued by an authorised third party (often a local government) to certify compliance with geographical standards.⁶⁴ Meanwhile, the 'Agricultural and Fishery Products Quality Control Act' provides a separate registration system administered by the relevant ministries for agricultural and fishery products whose quality or reputation is correlated to a particular region.⁶⁵ This registration grants legal protection, including injunctions, damages, and criminal penalties for infringement.

Traditional Korean or foreign designs, including *batik*, may in principle be protected under the Trademark Act if they satisfy GI collective or certification mark requirements; although no directly comparable product exists in South Korea, Hansan Mosi, a regional ramie fabric from Hansan, South Chungcheong Province, illustrates a registered GI collective mark for a traditional textile.⁶⁶ Hansan Mosi is a weaving technique passed down for over 1,500 years and was registered as a UNESCO Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity in 2011.⁶⁷

Malaysian *batik* constitutes a form of TCE developed through wax-resist dyeing and region-specific traditions preserved by communities in Kelantan,

⁵⁶ India, The Geographical Indications of Goods (Registration and Protection) Act, 1999, No. 48 of 1999, Section 2(1)(e).

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, Section 11.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, Section 21.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, Section 22.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, Chapter VIII.

⁶¹ Meghna Chaudhary, Bhawna Agarwal, and Meena Bhatia, "Socio-Economic Condition of Small-Scale Producers in Varanasi: A Case of Banaras Brocade and Saree," *Journal of Intellectual Property Rights* 26, no. 5 (2021): 289.

⁶² Seoyoung Byeon and Jong-Ho Lee, "How to Activate Geographical Indications to Cope with Globalization?," *Journal of Industrial Property* 79 (2024): 481.

⁶³ Trademark Act, Art. 2 Sec.1 Para. 6 and Art. 33, Art. 36 Sec. 5.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, Art. 2 Sec.1 Para. 8.

⁶⁵ Agricultural and Fishery Products Quality Control Act, Art. 2 Sec. 1 Para. 8 and Art. 32.

⁶⁶ Lee Kyung-seok, "Seocheon 'Hansan Mosi' Jirijeokpyosi Deungnok," *Nongmin Sinmun*, January 12, 2007, <https://www.nongmin.com/article/20070112155390>.

⁶⁷ "Weaving of Mosi (fine ramie) in the Hansan Region," UNESCO Intangible Cultural Heritage, accessed February 26, 2026, <https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/weaving-of-mosi-fine-ramie-in-the-hansan-region-00453>.

Terengganu, Pahang, and Johor.⁶⁸ The distinctive characteristics of *Batik Kelantan*, *Batik Terengganu*, and *Batik Pahang Diraja* form the basis for protection under Malaysia's Geographical Indications Act 2022 (Act 836), which defines GI consistently with Article 22 of TRIPS, conferring exclusive rights upon authorised users (s.20) and prohibiting false or misleading use to mislead the public (s.21).⁶⁹ This is particularly relevant given widespread imitation *batik*, digitally printed textiles, and counterfeit imports.⁷⁰ Registration requires detailed product specifications related to traditional methods, motif characteristics, and raw materials to geographical origin.⁷¹ Complementary initiatives by Kraftangan Malaysia and the Malaysian Handicraft Development Corporation support certification and commercial enhancement of Malaysian *batik* as a communal cultural asset,⁷² positioning it as a commercial handicraft while remaining a cultural heritage expression requiring preservation.

In Indonesia, the strengthening of GI protection, including for *Batik Tulis Lasem*, and the development of local commodity-based economies have been reinforced through the GI Roadmap Policy 2025-2029, launched by the DGIP under the Ministry of Law on 30 December 2024, whose formal institutionalisation through a Presidential Regulation remains in progress as of early 2026. The Roadmap otherwise pursues five further measures: raising GI awareness, strengthening digital infrastructure for registration and supervision, increasing registered GI products, building rights holders' capacity, and expanding market access through the Geographical Indication Goes to Marketplace Program.⁷³

⁶⁸ See Rohaida Nordin and Siti Safina Abu Bakar, "Malaysian Batik Industry: Protecting Local Batik Design by Copyright and Industrial Design Laws," *International Journal of Business and Society* 13, no. 2 (2012): 121; and Ira Brunchilda Hubner Juliana et al., "Revitalizing Local Heritage: The Role of Zie Batik in Advancing Community-Based Tourism in Malon Gunungpati," In *Studies in Systems, Decision and Control* (SSDC 612), ed. Bahaaeddin Alareeni (Cham, Springer, 2026), 469.

⁶⁹ See Malaysia, Geographical Indications Act 2022 (Act 836), s.2; TRIPs Agreement, Art 22; and "Geographical Indication Basic," Malaysian Intellectual Property Corporation (MyIPO), accessed February 20, 2026, <https://www.myipo.gov.my/geographical-indication-basic/>; and Nordin and Bakar, *op. cit.*, 122.

⁷⁰ Malaysia, Geographical Indications Act 2022 (Act 836), ss.20–21.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, s.24.

⁷² See Suriyati Binti Salim, "Preservation of Malaysian Batik Heritage: Balancing Traditional Techniques and Innovation through IP Protection," *Journal of Propulsion Technology* 45, no. 3 (2024): 2441; Andari et al., *op.cit.*, 228; and Kraftangan Malaysia and Malaysian Handicraft Development Corporation, "National Handicraft Sustainability Report (2022)", 36.

⁷³ Asoka Ulfa Ahsan, "DJKI Gelar FGD Penajaman Peta Jalan Indikasi Geografis Nasional 2026–2029, Dorong Perlindungan Produk Daerah," *Jurnal Makassar*, March 8, 2026, <https://jurnalmakassar.pikiran-rakyat.com/trending/pr-8210063099/djki-gelar-fgd-penajaman-peta-jalan-indikasi-geografis-nasional-20262029-dorong-perlindungan-produk-daerah>.

2.3. Protection of the *Batik Tulis Lasem* Geographical Indication and the Challenges of Commodification

2.3.1. The Paradox of Commodification: Tensions between GI Protection and Cultural Authenticity

Over time, traditional *batik* textiles have shifted from goods primarily created to fulfil ritual and cultural functions to commodities traded in the market. This process attributes economic value to cultural elements previously valued for their intrinsic communal significance.⁷⁴ As part of the creative economy, community-based tourism and international trade, *batik* has become embedded within broader commercial systems.⁷⁵

The relationship between TCEs and GI in the context of *Batik Tulis Lasem* is direct and reciprocal. *Batik Tulis Lasem*, as a TCE, embodies the collective creativity, historical acculturation, and living cultural practices of the *Lasem* artisan community. At the same time, GI protection serves as a formal legal instrument that provides territorial and commercial form to what is essentially a communally held cultural expression. It effectively translates TCEs' intangible identity into a bounded, enforceable economic right. The GI regime thereby creates a structured channel through which TCEs can enter the market while theoretically preserving its authenticity and community-based character. However, this translation is far from neutral: it necessarily imposes categories of membership, technical specification, and exclusivity onto a tradition that historically evolved through open, cross-cultural interchange. It is precisely this tension that the present article seeks to illuminate: GI functions as both a guardian and a transformer of TCEs, simultaneously protecting and redefining the cultural heritage it seeks to preserve.

The commodification of TCE raises concerns about the dilution of cultural values as market-oriented priorities increasingly prevail,⁷⁶ risking an excessive focus on commercial viability at the expense of traditional products' cultural significance.⁷⁷ For *Batik Tulis Lasem*, GI protection cuts both ways: it safeguards quality standards and production processes tied to cultural tradition, including motifs and hand-drawn techniques documented in the GI Book of Requirements, while simultaneously enhancing commercial value and market visibility. By differentiating *Batik Tulis Lasem*

⁷⁴ Sebastian Krügel, Matthias Uhl, and Ingo Pies, "The Folk Ethics of Commodification: An Empirical Investigation into Moral Attitudes Against Market Transactions," *Journal of Business Ethics* 203, no. 1 (2026): 197.

⁷⁵ See Dewi Yulianti and Endang Susilowati, "Developing the Motifs and the Strategies to Survive of Semarang Batik Creative Industries, in Semarang Central Java Province, Indonesia," *E3S Web of Conferences* 359 (2022): 4; Juliana et al., *op. cit.*, 470; and Wan Nor Jazmina Wan Ariffin et al., "Innovation Strategies in the Batik Industry for the Sustainability of Cultural Heritage and the Empowerment of the Ummah's Economy," *Global Journal Al-Thaqafah*, no. Special Issue (2024): 221.

⁷⁶ Vida Savoniakaitė, "Traditional Textiles and Economic Development: Lithuanian Groups in Latvia's Border Regions," in *Culture and Economy: Contemporary Perspectives*, ed. Ullrich Kockel (London: Routledge 2019), 119.

⁷⁷ Susmita Roy, Pankaj Pratap Singh, and Abhijit Padun, "Bridging Tangible Artifacts and Its Intangible Expressions: MAR and CNN Integration for Reviving the Traditional Identity of Tribal Fabrics," *Digital Applications in Archaeology and Cultural Heritage* 39 (2025): 2.

from other batik based on its Lasem origin, distinctive techniques, and motifs, GI protection facilitates market access and competitive advantage, essential for maintaining market uniqueness and reputation.⁷⁸

Traditional art forms protected under GIs often struggle to reach a broader audience due to limited awareness and accessibility stemming from their exclusive ownership structures,⁷⁹ a challenge not unique to *Batik Tulis Lasem* but common across GI-certified crafts. Within the Lasem artisan community, craftsmen who are not MPIG members are restricted from using registered Lasem *batik* motifs and are prohibited from using the *Batik Tulis Lasem* GI label. *Batik* communities outside Rembang Regency's administrative territory are similarly barred from producing *Batik Tulis Lasem* under the GI regime. These conditions have the potential to generate social tensions and may even escalate into legal disputes.

From a legal standpoint, several remedial solutions may be proposed to address the social tensions arising from GI exclusivity. First, the MPIG should establish a transparent, participatory membership mechanism that allows previously excluded artisans to apply for registered membership upon demonstrating compliance with specifications. Second, a tiered licensing system could enable non-MPIG artisans in adjacent areas to apply for a differentiated certification, such as a collective mark under Law 20/2016, acknowledging their craft's cultural affinity without misrepresenting their products as certified *Batik Tulis Lasem*. Third, the DGIP and local government should proactively activate non-litigious dispute resolution channels, including the Intellectual Property Arbitration and Mediation Board or *Badan Arbitrase dan Mediasi Hak Kekayaan Intelektual* (BAM HKI),⁸⁰ while simultaneously pursuing parallel registration of *Batik Lasem* as a TCEs within the CIP data system under Government Regulation 56/2022⁸¹ to document its cultural heritage dimensions independent of GI status formally.

The proliferation of imitation *batik* (colour-printed, wax-printed, and discharge-printed textiles) poses a further threat for authentic *Batik Tulis*, as distinguishing genuine hand-drawn *batik* from imitations remains difficult even for experts, weakening the market given the substantial price disparity.⁸² This materialised when a non-MPIG Lasem *batik* community produced colour-printed *batik* using GI-protected motifs and sold them at a national exhibition in Jakarta, a case resolved through *Penyidik Pegawai*

⁷⁸ Paloma De Mattos Fagundes et al., "Geographical Indication as a Market Orientation Strategy: An Analysis of Producers of High-Quality Wines in Southern Brazil," *Journal of Database Marketing and Customer Strategy Management* 19, no. 3 (2012): 174.

⁷⁹ Chalamalasetty Durga Nandini, Ch Rupa, and B H N Chandana, "AR for GI Protection: Exploring Kalamkari Art for Digital Heritage and Cultural Education," *Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Intelligent Communication Technologies and Virtual Mobile Networks (ICICV)* (2025): 259.

⁸⁰ Law 20/2016, Art. 93.

⁸¹ Government Regulation 56/2022, Art. 16.

⁸² Zohanto Widyantoko et al., "Expert Role in Image Classification Using CNN for Hard to Identify Object: Distinguishing Batik and Its Imitation," *IAES International Journal of Artificial Intelligence* 10, no. 1 (2021): 94.

Negeri Sipil (Civil Servant Investigators or PPNS) mediation, resulting in compensation and a formal commitment against future infringement.⁸³

2.3.2. Toward Sustainable Governance: Supervision, Comparative Lessons, and a Community-Centred Framework

A further challenge lies in the necessity of motif innovation to appeal to younger generations and contemporary markets.⁸⁴ GI protection plays a dual role, safeguarding tradition and enabling creative innovation: collaborations between researchers and artisans have produced new motifs blending traditional craftsmanship with modern aesthetics, supported by capacity-building programs that enhance both artistic quality and economic viability.⁸⁵

Commodification poses a serious threat when mass production is prioritised over quality and authenticity, risking the abandonment of the traditional techniques that constitute Lasem *batik*'s distinctive identity. Effective supervision is therefore essential to GI compliance. Quality control operates through a multi-layered mechanism: MPIG's internal supervisory team ensures producers' compliance with GI specifications, while the DGIP's external GI Expert Team, working with local government, monitors quality and prevents unauthorised use. Supervision parameters include membership changes, market reach and pricing, quality-testing data, logo compliance, and the identification of unregistered users, with public reporting of non-conformance. Supervisory outcomes may recommend continuation or revocation of GI protection under Articles 35-36 of the Ministry of Law and Human Rights Regulation No. 12 of 2019 concerning Geographical Indications (MoLHR Regulation 12/2019), as amended by MoLHR Regulation No. 10 of 2022 (MoLHR Regulation 10/2022).

A central challenge in GI protection lies in the need for rigorous supervision and consistent enforcement; without effective monitoring, unauthorised producers can misuse the *Batik Lasem* name and market non-compliant goods. Similar difficulties are observed across several other jurisdictions. In India, the existing legal framework is often criticised for its limited scope and weak enforcement, illustrated by the Calcutta High Court's ruling in *Tea Board, India v. ITC Limited*, which confined GI rights over "Darjeeling" to the goods for which the indication is registered (tea), narrowing protection's practical scope and, combined with weak monitoring, fuelling counterfeit proliferation that undermines legitimate producers' income.⁸⁶ Malaysia also faces similar challenges, particularly in strengthening oversight mechanisms and law enforcement against GI

⁸³ Tri Wijanarko, "The Geographical Indication Protection of Batik Lasem," interview by Shofiy Zulfah and Moh. Asadullah Hasan Al Asy'arie, Semarang, July 2, 2025.

⁸⁴ Basiroen, Andhini, and Manuaba, *op. cit.*, 271.

⁸⁵ Vera Jenny Basiroen and Ida Bagus Kerthyayana Manuaba, "The Sustainability of Batik Tulis Lasem through Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) in the New Motif Design," *AIP Conference Proceedings* 2594, (2023): 3.

⁸⁶ Calcutta High Court, India, *Tea Board, India v. ITC Limited*, GA No. 3137 of 2010, CS No. 250 of 2010 (February 4, 2019), MANU/WB/0277/2019, 37–38; and Anna Bashir, "Protection of Geographical Indication Products from Different States of India," *Journal of Intellectual Property Rights* 25, no. 3–4 (2020): 75.

infringements, as well as ensuring consistent quality standards for registered products. These challenges are reflected in *Maestro v. Chocosuisse*, where the claimant, even after the Geographical Indications Act 2000 had come into force, continued to rely on the common law action of passing off rather than the GI Act itself.⁸⁷ This case underscores the continuing limitations of statutory GI enforcement in practice. Limited institutional capacity and low awareness among business actors further hinder efforts to prevent counterfeit circulation in both domestic and international markets.⁸⁸

In Korea, GI protection adopts a multi-layered approach spanning the Trademark Act, the Agricultural and Fishery Products Quality Control Act, the Unfair Competition Prevention and Trade Secret Protection Act, and various Free Trade Agreements (FTAs), generating considerable complexity and potential inconsistency across regulations.⁸⁹ *Batik Tulis Lasem's* development as a GI-protected product also faces internal challenges, including production of Lasem-characteristic batik using non-handwritten techniques by local communities, and production by artisans outside the designated geographical area, particularly in Pekalongan, where artisans originating from Lasem do not meet GI specification requirements.⁹⁰ Such practices generate social tension, since batik with Lasem motifs could previously be produced freely regardless of location.

Extending this argument, the article proposes a community-centred stewardship framework as the governing concept for GI administration. This model draws conceptually on the notion of "heritage commons," under which cultural heritage is managed as a resource held and negotiated collectively by its community rather than treated as state or privately-owned property.⁹¹ Rather than treating supervision as a purely regulatory compliance exercise, this framework positions it as an ongoing, participatory process in which MPIG, artisans, local government, and cultural institutions collectively negotiate the boundaries of authenticity, innovation, and access. Concretely, supervision parameters should expand beyond current administrative indicators to include socio-cultural indicators, such as intergenerational knowledge transmission, preservation of traditional dyeing techniques, and community cohesion, which should be evaluated through periodic community consultations and cultural impact assessments, alongside

⁸⁷ Federal Court of Malaysia, *Maestro Swiss Chocolate Sdn Bhd & Ors v. Chocosuisse Union des Fabricants Suisses de Chocolat & Ors*, [2016] 2 MLJ 359, paras 70-76.

⁸⁸ Al Hanisham Mohd Khalid, et al., "Geographical Indications in Malaysia and Indonesia: Enhancing Protections for Economic Growth and Cultural Heritage," *ASEAN Legal Insight* 1 (2024): 42.

⁸⁹ Ingyu Kim, "A Study on Geographical Indications in Korea," *Journal of Korea Law* 23, no. 2 (2024): 453.

⁹⁰ Alberto Ribeiro de Almeida, *The New EU Regime on Geographical Indications: Opportunities and Challenges In The Future of Geographical Indications: European and Global Perspectives*, ed. by Andrea Zappalaglio and Enrico Bonadio (Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd. 2025), 110.

⁹¹ Stelios Lekakis, "A Political Economy of Heritage and the Commons: A First Sketch Focusing on Greece," in *Cultural Heritage in the Realm of the Commons: Conversations on the Case of Greece*, ed. Stelios Lekakis (London: Ubiquity Press, 2020): 36.

technical compliance checks. In practical terms, this can be operationalised through blockchain-based traceability and QR-code verification, whereby each *Batik Tulis Lasem* product carries a digital identity recording the artisan's name, motif philosophy, *batik*-making technique, and compliance with the GI Book of Requirements, enabling more effective monitoring of misuse across e-commerce platforms and conventional markets alike.⁹²

Where commodification is unavoidable, deliberate management is required to prevent erosion of cultural essence, for instance through diversifying *Batik Tulis Lasem* into modern products such as ready-to-wear garments, bags, or accessories while preserving traditional motifs and techniques. This allows artisans to access broader markets while keeping the heritage embodied in *Batik Tulis Lasem* alive for future generations, provided GI designation is matched with effective, well-structured governance.

2.4. Upcoming Development

Drawing from the preceding analysis, several recommendations are advanced to strengthen the protection and sustainable development of *Batik Tulis Lasem* as a Traditional Cultural Expression. First, the DGIP and relevant government agencies should expedite the parallel registration of *Batik Tulis Lasem* within the national CIP data system, as required by Government Regulation 56/2022. Second, the Ministry of Law and Human Rights should revise MoLHR Regulation 12/2019 to make socio-cultural impact assessments a mandatory criterion for GI supervision. Third, an open-access capacity-building program should support artisans currently operating outside the GI framework, particularly those in Pekalongan who produce Lasem-style batik, enabling them to meet GI specifications or to seek alternative certification through collective mark schemes. Fourth, the GI Roadmap 2025–2029 should incorporate cultural preservation metrics alongside its economic indicators. Fifth, the blockchain-based traceability and QR-code verification system discussed above should be adopted to strengthen real-time authentication and counterfeit prevention across e-commerce and conventional markets.

As a result, these measures should be understood as elements of an ongoing process rather than a definitive endpoint: the protection of *Batik Tulis Lasem*, as a Geographical Indication, requires continuous negotiation between legal frameworks and evolving cultural practice, sustained through active engagement among regulators, artisans, and cultural institutions to keep the regime responsive, legitimate, and adaptive over time.

3. CONCLUSION

The designation of *Batik Tulis Lasem* as a Geographical Indication generates a fundamental paradox. By formalising collective cultural identity as bounded territorial rights, GI simultaneously protects the tradition from external appropriation and exposes it to internal pressures toward commodification, most visibly in the exclusion of non-MPIG artisans and the

⁹² Joanna Marszałek, “Blockchain and Traceability of Geographical Indication Products”, *Gdańskie Studia Prawnicze* 65, no. 4 (2024): 69.

risk of quality dilution under mass-market demand. Registered in 2023 under Law 20/2016, its protection remains indefinite, provided it is sustained through active community governance rather than relying on formal registration. Comparative analysis of India (GI Act 1999), South Korea (multi-layered GI system), and Malaysia (Geographical Indications Act 2022) collectively suggests that the key strategy for addressing commodification is not greater legal restrictiveness; rather, stronger and more inclusive governance mechanisms that ensure GI benefits flow to the originating community while remaining adaptive to evolving cultural practices. GI protection should thus be understood not as a finished legal achievement but as an ongoing negotiation between legal control and living cultural practice.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors acknowledge the Directorate General of Intellectual Property, Ministry of Law of the Republic of Indonesia, the Regional Office of the Ministry of Law of Central Java, and the Batik Lasem community for the information provided for this study. The authors further acknowledge the financial support of the Institute for Research and Community Service of Universitas Diponegoro (LPPM UNDIP) under the Professorial Research Grant scheme.

REFERENCES

Book

- de Almeida, Alberto Ribeiro. "The New EU Regime on Geographical Indications: Opportunities and Challenges." In *The Future of Geographical Indications: European and Global Perspectives*, edited by Andrea Zappalaglio and Enrico Bonadio. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd. 2025. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781035309153.00016>
- Doellah, Santoso. *Batik Pengaruh Zaman dan Lingkungannya*. Danar Hadi. 2002.
- Hoon, Hum Sin. *Zheng He's Art of Collaboration: Understanding the Legendary Chinese Admiral from a Management Perspective*. ISEAS Publishing. 2012. <https://bookshop.iseas.edu.sg/publication/468>
- Juliana, Ira Brunchilda Hubner, et al. "Revitalizing Local Heritage: The Role of Zie Batik in Advancing Community-Based Tourism in Malon Gunungpati." In *Studies in Systems, Decision and Control* (SSDC 612, edited by Bahaaeddin Alareeni. Cham, Springer, 2026. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-99466-1_43
- Lekakis, Stelios. "A Political Economy of Heritage and the Commons: A First Sketch Focusing on Greece." In *Cultural Heritage in the Realm of the Commons: Conversations on the Case of Greece*, edited by Stelios Lekakis. London: Ubiquity Press. 2020. <https://doi.org/10.5334/bcj.c>
- Lewis, Gertrude Clayton. "First Lesson in Batik: A Handbook in Batik, Tie-Dyeing and All Pattern Dyeing." New York: The Prang Company, 1922.

- Marie-Vivien, Delphine. "Do Geographical Indications for Handicrafts Deserve a Special Regime? Insights from Worldwide Law and Practice." In *Ius Gentium: Comparative Perspectives on Law and Justice* (IUSGENT 58), edited by William van Caenegem and Jen Cleary. Cham: Springer, 2017. https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-319-53073-4_9
- Nwauche, Enyinna. *The Protection of Traditional Cultural Expressions in Africa*. Springer International Publishing. 2017. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-57231-4>
- Savoniakaitė, Vida. "Traditional Textiles and Economic Development: Lithuanian Groups in Latvia's Border Regions." in *Culture and Economy: Contemporary Perspectives*, edited by Ullrich Kockel. London: Routledge, 2019. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315195469>
- Vandecandelaere, Emilie, et al. "Introduction, A Worldwide Perspective of Geographical Indications in a Time of Changes: Crossed Views Between Researchers, Policy Makers and Practitioners" In *Worldwide Perspectives on Geographical Indications*, edited by Vandecandelaere, Emilie, et al. Cham: Springer, 2025. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-71641-6_1

Journal Article

- Andari, Dwi Wulan Titik, et al. "Local Wisdom in the Land System of Manggarai's Indigenous People, Indonesia." *ISVS E-Journal* 10. no. 9 (2023): 223–143. <https://doi.org/10.61275/ISVSej-2023-10-09-16>
- Ariffin, Wan Nor Jazmina Wan, et al. "Innovation Strategies in the Batik Industry for the Sustainability of Cultural Heritage and the Empowerment of the Ummah's Economy." *Global Journal Al-Thaqafah*, no. Special Issue (2024): 209–226. <https://doi.org/10.7187/GJATSI122024-14>
- Bashir, Anna. "Protection of Geographical Indication Products from Different States of India." *Journal of Intellectual Property Rights* 25. no. 3–4 (2020): 74–79. <https://doi.org/10.56042/jipr.v25i3-4.17397>
- Basiroen, Vera Jenny. "Creating Batik Lasem through a Comparative Study of Batik Lasem and Champa in the 15th to 19th Century." *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, 729 (2021): 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/729/1/012064>.
- Basiroen, Vera Jenny and Ida Bagus Kerthyayana Manuaba. "Batik Lasem Motifs Dataset: Gunung Ringgit, Kricak, Latoan, Nyuk Pitu, Seritan." *Data in Brief* 61 (2025): 1-34. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dib.2025.111866>
- Basiroen, Vera Jenny and Ida Bagus Kerthyayana Manuaba. "The Sustainability of Batik Tulis Lasem through Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) in the New Motif Design." *AIP Conference Proceedings* 2594 (2023): 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0109565>
- Basiroen, Vera Jenny and Ida Bagus Kerthyayana Manuaba. "The Cultural Aspect of Javanese and Chinese Acculturation in Lasem." *Humaniora: Journal of Indonesian Culture and Society* 13. no. 2 (2022): 91-97. <https://doi.org/10.21512/humaniora.v13i2.7527>

- Basiroen, Vera Jenny, Grasheli Kusuma Andhini, and Ida Bagus Kerthyayana Manuaba. "Preserving Tradition: Motif Design Development for Batik Tulis Lasem." *IAFOR Journal of Cultural Studies* 10. no. 1 (2025): 269–293. <https://doi.org/10.22492/ijcs.10.1.11>
- Bell, Adrian Viliami and Anna Paegle. "Ethnic Markers and How to Find Them: An Ethnographic Investigation of Marker Presence, Recognition, and Social Information." *Human Nature* 32. no. 2 (2021): 470–481. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12110-021-09401-z>
- Byeon, Seoyoung and Jong-Ho Lee. "How to Activate Geographical Indications to Cope with Glocalization?." *Journal of Industrial Property* 79 (2024): 475–512. <https://www.kci.go.kr/kciportal/ci/sereArticleSearch/ciSereArtiView.kci?sereArticleSearchBean.artiId=ART003160258>
- Chaudhary, Meghna, Bhawna Agarwal, and Meena Bhatia. "Geographical Indications in India: A Case of Handicraft Industry in Uttar Pradesh." *Journal of World Intellectual Property* 25. no. 3 (2022): 617–634. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jwip.12244>
- Chaudhary, Meghna, Bhawna Agarwal, and Meena Bhatia. "Socio-Economic Condition of Small-Scale Producers in Varanasi: A Case of Banaras Brocade and Saree." *Journal of Intellectual Property Rights* 26. no. 5 (2021): 286–294. <https://nopr.niscpr.res.in/handle/123456789/58959>
- Cheng, Yu and Sandeep Sikka. "Exploring Spiritual Continuity: The Du Jie Ceremony as a Manifestation of Religious Identity and Cultural Resilience among the Yao Ethnic Group in Hunan, China." *International Journal of Interdisciplinary Cultural Studies* 20. no. 1 (2024): 97–118. <https://doi.org/10.18848/2327-008X/CGP/v20i01/97-118>
- Covarrubia, Patricia. "The Disappearance of Traditions: The Use of Geographical Indications and Collective Marks to Prevent Loss of Culture in South America." *IIC International Review of Intellectual Property and Competition Law* 55. no. 8 (2024): 1257–1280. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40319-024-01519-8>
- Cristallo, Domenico. "Geographical Indications and Biodiversity: An Overview of Regulatory Challenges and Critical Perspectives." *New Medit.* no. 3 (2025): 47–58. <https://doi.org/10.30682/nm2503e>
- Devi, Renuka and V Selvam. "Weaver Awareness and Perception of Geographical Indication Tags," *International Journal of Computational and Experimental Science and Engineering* 11. no. 1 (2025): 1032–1043. <https://doi.org/10.22399/ijcesen.933>
- Dharmawan, Ni Ketut Supasti, et al. "Quo Vadis Traditional Cultural Expressions Protection: Threats from Personal Intellectual Property and Artificial Intelligence." *Law Reform: Jurnal Pembaharuan Hukum* 19. no. 2 (2023): 321–343. <https://doi.org/10.14710/lr.v19i2.58639>

- Fagundes, Paloma De Mattos, et al. "Geographical Indication as a Market Orientation Strategy: An Analysis of Producers of High-Quality Wines in Southern Brazil." *Journal of Database Marketing and Customer Strategy Management* 19. no. 3 (2012): 163–178. <https://doi.org/10.1057/dbm.2012.18>
- Gajić, Tamara, et al. "Geographical Indications as Attractors for Rural Tourism: Insights from the Countryside of Serbia." *Geojournal of Tourism and Geosites* 59. no. 2 (2025): 856–869. <https://doi.org/10.30892/gtg.59230-1462>
- Gupta, Anil. "Traditional Cultural Expressions: Analysis of Culinary Custom." *Journal of Intellectual Property Rights* 27. no. 1 (2022): 52–60. <https://doi.org/10.56042/jipr.v27i1.32237>
- Harding, Diana, et al. "Geographical Indication in Indonesia: A Review on the Spatial Distribution and Classification of Geographical Indication-Registered Products and -Related Publications." *The Journal of World Intellectual Property* 28. no. 1 (2025): 263–285. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jwip.12332>
- Jened, Rahmi, Agus Sujatmiko, and Bunga N Indah Sari. "Strategy in Developing a Community Model and Preparing a Specification Book of Geographical Indication Protection for Tropical Apple Variety of Batu City, East Java Province." *NTUT Journal of Intellectual Property Law and Management* 13. no. 2 (2024): 49–90. <https://scholar.unair.ac.id/en/publications/strategy-in-developing-a-community-model-and-preparing-a-specific/>
- Khalid, Al Hanisham Mohd, et al. "Geographical Indications in Malaysia and Indonesia: Enhancing Protections for Economic Growth and Cultural Heritage." *ASEAN Legal Insight* 1 (2024): 33–53. <https://doi.org/10.32890/aseanli2024.1.3>
- Kim, Ingyu. "A Study on Geographical Indications in Korea." *Journal of Korea Law* 23. no. 2 (2024): 451–487. https://s-space.snu.ac.kr/bitstream/10371/214981/1/08_A_Study_on_Geographical_Indications_in_Korea_%28Ingyu_Kim%29.pdf
- Klein, Laurence, María Jesús Muñoz-Torres, and María Ángeles Fernández-Izquierdo. "Free, Prior, and Informed Consent." *International Journal on Minority and Group Rights* 31. no. 5 (2024): 898–926. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15718115-bja10153>
- Krügel, Sebastian, Matthias Uhl, and Ingo Pies. "The Folk Ethics of Commodification: An Empirical Investigation into Moral Attitudes Against Market Transactions." *Journal of Business Ethics* 203. no. 1 (2026): 181–203. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-025-06049-y>
- Kudiya, Komarudin and Saftiyaningsih Ken Atik. "The Importance of the Governor Regulation in Supporting the Geographical Indication of Batik Production in West Java." *Jurnal Media Hukum* 27. no. 1 (2020): 121–132. <https://doi.org/10.18196/jmh.20200146>

- Lai, Meng Yew and Yusten Karulus. "The Indonesia-Malaysia Cultural Heritage Disputes: A Case Study of the Pendet Dance and Rasa Sayange Folk Song." *MANU: Jurnal Pusat Penataran Ilmu dan Bahasa* 29 (2019): 137-172.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/342869491_THE_INDONESIA-MALAYSIA_CULTURAL_HERITAGE_DISPUTES_A_CASE_STUDY_OF_THE_PENDET_DANCE_AND_RASA_SAYANGE_FOLK_SONG
- Li, Xiaoli, Mohd Andari Mohd Khair, and Wei Ying. "Exploration of Copyright Law Safeguards for Traditional Cultural Expressions (TCEs)." *International Journal of Criminal Justice Sciences* 19. no. 1 (2024): 117-134. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19107>
- Lukman, Christine Claudia, Yunita Setyoningrum, and Sandy Rismantojo. "Revealing the Intangible Values in Lasem Batik Motif." *Journal of Arts and Humanities* 8. no. 9 (2019): 64-72.
<https://www.theartsjournal.org/index.php/site/article/view/1728>
- Ma, Teng-Fei, Chang-Wei Chai, and Tseng-Wei Chao. "On the Study of the Sustainable Development of Intangible Cultural Heritage of Indigenous Peoples' Diets, Take the Protection of Geographical Indications as an Example." *Sustainability* 14. no. 19 (2022): 1-27.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/su141912803>
- Malik, Isfaq Hussain. "Principles for ethical research in the Himalayas: Decolonising research ethics across the disciplines." *Humanities Social Sciences Communications* 13. no. 168 (2026): 1-17.
<https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-026-06826-8>
- Marszałek, Joanna. "Blockchain and Traceability of Geographical Indication Products." *Gdańskie Studia Prawnicze* 65. no. 4 (2024): 66-72.
<https://doi.org/10.26881/gsp.2024.4.04>
- Minarno, Agus Eko, Indah Soesanti, and Hanung Adi Nugroho. "Dataset of Batik Nitik Sarimbit 120." *Data in Brief* 55 (2024): 1-8.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dib.2024.110671>
- Mosley, Ariel J, et al. "Perceptions of Harm and Benefit Predict Judgments of Cultural Appropriation." *Social Psychological and Personality Science* 15. no. 3 (2024): 299-308.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/19485506231162401>
- Nandini, Chalamalasetty Durga, Ch Rupa, and B H N Chandana. "AR for GI Protection: Exploring Kalamkari Art for Digital Heritage and Cultural Education." *Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Intelligent Communication Technologies and Virtual Mobile Networks (ICICV)* (2025): 258-263.
<https://doi.org/10.1109/ICICV64824.2025.11085851>

- Ningsih, Yosepin Sri and Dwi Isma Aryani. "Fashion Design as a Method to Improve the Sustainability of Batik Lasem Industry - Sustainability in Creative Industries". *Sustainability in Creative Industries. SCI 2022. Advances in Science, Technology & Innovation* (2024): 35-44. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/379919746_Fashion_Design_as_a_Method_to_Improve_the_Sustainability_of_Batik_Lasem_Industry
- Nordin, Rohaida and Siti Safina Abu Bakar. "Malaysian Batik Industry: Protecting Local Batik Design by Copyright and Industrial Design Laws." *International Journal of Business and Society* 13. no. 2 (2012): 117-132. <https://www.ijbs.unimas.my/volume-11-20/volume-13-no-2-2012/171-malaysian-batik-industry-protecting-local-batik-design-by-copyright-and-industrial-design-laws>
- Palar, Miranda Risang Ayu, Laina Rafianti, and Helitha Novianty Muchtar. "Inclusive Rights to Protect Communal Intellectual Property: Indonesian Perspective on Its New Government Regulation Inclusive Rights to Protect Communal Intellectual Property: Indonesian Perspective on Its New Government Regulation." *Cogent Social Sciences* 9. no. 2 (2023): 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2023.2274431>
- Permatasari, Puspita Ayu and Lorenzo Cantoni. "Indonesian Tourism and Batik: An Online Map." *E-Review of Tourism Research* 16. no. 2-3 (2019): 184-194. <https://ertr-ojs-tamu.tdl.org/ertr/article/view/331/104>
- Putranti, Deslaely and Dewi Analis Indriyani. "Perlindungan Indikasi Geografis oleh Masyarakat Perlindungan Indikasi Geografis Pasca Sertifikasi di Yogyakarta." *Jurnal Ilmiah Kebijakan Hukum* 15. no. 3 (2021): 395-414. <https://doi.org/10.30641/kebijakan.2021.V15.395-414>
- Roisah, Kholis, et al. "Empowering Cultural Communities In Protecting Traditional Expressions: Legal Challenges In The Digital Age." *Diponegoro Law Review* 10. no. 2 (2025): 134-156. <https://doi.org/10.14710/dilrev.10.2.2025.134-156>
- Roy, Susmita, Pankaj Pratap Singh, and Abhijit Padun. "Bridging Tangible Artifacts and Its Intangible Expressions: MAR and CNN Integration for Reviving the Traditional Identity of Tribal Fabrics." *Digital Applications in Archaeology and Cultural Heritage* 39 (2025): 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.daach.2025.e00470>
- Sahabuddin, Wahyuddin and Andi Hildayanti. "Influence of Cosmology in Life and Architecture: Insights from the Kajang People of Indonesia." *ISVS E-Journal* 10. no. 6 (2023): 26-38. http://isvshome.com/pdf/ISVS_10-6/ISVSej_10.6.3.pdf
- Salim, Suriyati Binti. "Preservation of Malaysian Batik Heritage: Balancing Traditional Techniques and Innovation through IP Protection." *Journal of Propulsion Technology* 45. no. 3 (2024): 2438-2446. <https://www.propulsiontechjournal.com/index.php/journal/article/view/7607>

- Setiyono et al. "Has Indonesia Safeguarded Traditional Cultural Expressions?." *Jambura Law Review* 6. no. 2 (2024): 206–239. <https://doi.org/10.33756/jlr.v6i2.24106>
- Setyawan, Fadjar Ramdhani, Sudarsono, and Yuliati. "Inconsistency of the Concept of Legal Protection of Traditional Cultural Expressions with Theory of Legal Ideals." *De Jure: Jurnal Hukum dan Syar'iah* 13. no. 1 (2021): 126–139. <https://doi.org/10.18860/j-fsh.v13i1.10025>
- Sreenath K.P and Anson Jose. "Geographical Indications and Traditional Cultural Expressions: A Comparative Legal Analysis of the GI Laws of Indonesia and India and a Case Study Analysis." *The Journal of World Intellectual Property* 26. no. 3 (2023): 339–356. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jwip.12274>
- Suratno, Ujang and Rahmanisa Purnamasari Faujura. "Effectiveness of Law Enforcement of National and International Instruments for the Protection of Traditional Cultural Expressions as Intangible Cultural Heritage in Indonesia." *Journal of Ecohumanism* 3. no. 7 (2024): 3374–3385. <https://doi.org/10.62754/joe.v3i7.4470>
- Susantio, Mary Celica and Rachmi Kumala Widyasari. "The Influence of Peranakan Culture on the Typology of the Kidang Mas Batik House, Lasem." *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science* 1169 (2023): 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/1169/1/012067>
- Widyantoko, Zohanto, et al. "Expert Role in Image Classification Using CNN for Hard to Identify Object: Distinguishing Batik and Its Imitation." *IAES International Journal of Artificial Intelligence* 10. no. 1 (2021): 93–100. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijai.v10.i1.pp93-100>
- Wulandari, Fenny, et al. "Sui Generis System: GI Protection for the Herbal Product in Indonesia as Communal Property Right." *Cogent Social Sciences* 9. no. 1 (2023): 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2023.2176989>
- Yilmaz, Alptekin Mert, Özge Can Niyaz Altinok, and Oktay Tomar. "Consumers' Purchasing Behaviors of Product with Geographical Indication: The Case of Ezine Cheese." *Journal of Tekirdag Agricultural Faculty* 22. no. 2 (2025): 276–292. <https://doi.org/10.33462/jotaf.1389004>
- Yuliati, Dewi and Endang Susilowati. "Developing the Motifs and the Strategies to Survive of Semarang Batik Creative Industries, in Semarang Central Java Province, Indonesia." *E3S Web of Conferences* 359 (2022): 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202235902031>.

News or Magazine Article

- Ahsan, Asoka Ulfa. "DJKI Gelar FGD Penajaman Peta Jalan Indikasi Geografis Nasional 2026–2029, Dorong Perlindungan Produk Daerah." *Jurnal Makassar*. March 8, 2026. <https://jurnalmakassar.pikiran-rakyat.com/trending/pr-8210063099/djki-gelar-fgd-penajaman-peta-jalan-indikasi-geografis-nasional-20262029-dorong-perlindungan-produk-daerah>

Kyung-seok, Lee. "Seocheon 'Hansan Mosi' Jirijeokpyosi Deungnok." *Nongmin Sinmun*. January 12, 2007.
<https://www.nongmin.com/article/20070112155390>.

Interview

Wijanarko, Tri. "The Geographical Indication Protection of Batik Lasem." Interview by Shofiy Zulfah and Moh. Asadullah Hasan Al Asy'arie, Semarang, July 2, 2025.

Legal Document

Republic of Indonesia. The 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia.
Republic of Indonesia. Law No. 28 of 2014 concerning Copyright.
Republic of Indonesia. Law No. 5 of 2017 concerning Cultural Advancement.
Republic of Indonesia. Law No. 20 of 2016 concerning Trademarks and Geographical Indications.
Republic of Indonesia. Government Regulation No. 56 of 2022 concerning Communal Intellectual Property.
Republic of Indonesia. Ministry of Law and Human Rights Regulation No. 12 of 2019 concerning Geographical Indications.
Republic of Indonesia Ministry of Law and Human Rights Regulation No. 10 of 2022 concerning Amendment to Ministry of Law and Human Rights Regulation No. 12 of 2019 concerning Geographical Indications.
Malaysia. Geographical Indications Act 2022 (Act 836).
Malaysia. Geographical Indications Act 2000 (Act 602).
Republic of Korea. Agricultural and Fishery Products Quality Control Act, Act No. 5667, January 21, 1999, as amended by Act No. 19637, August 16, 2023.
Republic of Korea. Trademark Act, Act No. 71 of November 28, 1949, as amended.
Republic of India. Geographical Indications of Goods (Registration and Protection) Act, 1999.
Republic of. Geographical Indications of Goods (Registration and Protection) Rules, 2002.
UNESCO. Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, 2003.
World Trade Organization. Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPs Agreement), 1994.

Other Document

Directorate General of Intellectual Property. "Berita Resmi Indikasi Geografis Seri-A, No. 019/IG/VII/A/2023",
https://dgip.go.id/uploads/berita_resmi/file/6d045f8ca50fbec13339fe596919df99.pdf
Kraftangan Malaysia and Malaysian Handicraft Development Corporation. "National Handicraft Sustainability Report (2022)."
<https://kraftangan.gov.my/en/info/annual-report>
Sajeev, Aparna, et al. "Protection of Ritualistic Performances and Challenges of Copyright Law in the Digital World: A Case Study of Theyyam - AIP Conference Proceedings." <https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0123590>

Case Law

Calcutta High Court, India. *Tea Board, India v. ITC Limited*, GA No. 3137 of 2010, CS No. 250 of 2010 (February 4, 2019). MANU/WB/0277/2019.
Federal Court of Malaysia. *Maestro Swiss Chocolate Sdn Bhd & Ors v. Chocosuisse Union des Fabricants Suisses de Chocolat & Ors*, [2016] 2 MLJ 359.

Web Page

- "Batik Lasem Burung Hong." Pinterest. Accessed June 19, 2026. <https://pin.it/5AKPHkUz6>
- "Batik Tulis Lasem." Pangkalan Data Kekayaan Intelektual. Accessed July 27, 2026. <https://pdki-indonesia.dgip.go.id/detail/e3b0c44298fc1c149afbf4c8996fb92427ae41e4649b934ca495991b7852b855>
- "Geographical Indication Basic." Malaysian Intellectual Property Corporation (MyIPO). accessed February 20, 2026. <https://www.myipo.gov.my/geographical-indication-basic/>
- "GIs The 'Darling' of Europe, But Protection a Challenge for All, Producers Say." Catherine Saez. Accessed June 19, 2026. <https://www.ip-watch.org/2013/05/28/gis-the-darling-of-europe-but-protection-a-challenge-for-all-producers-say/>
- "Motif Batik Larangan Keraton Yogyakarta." Kraton Ngayogyakarta Hadiningrat. Accessed February 12, 2026. <https://www.kratonjogja.id/kagungan-dalem/12-motif-batik-larangan-keraton-yogyakarta/>
- "South Korea Litigation & Dispute Resolution Comparative Guide." Mondaq. Accessed July 20, 2026. <https://www.mondaq.com/guides/results/28/1113/all/south-korea-litigation-dispute-resolution>
- "Weaving of Mosi (fine ramie) in the Hansan Region." UNESCO Intangible Cultural Heritage. Accessed February 26, 2026. <https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/weaving-of-mosi-fine-ramie-in-the-hansan-region-00453>