

Supplementary Appendix S1

Complete Corpus of Legal, Policy, Judicial, and Scholarly Sources

Manuscript

Cultural Sovereignty in the Age of AI: A Postcolonial Critique of Intellectual Property Frameworks for Indonesian Traditional Arts

Purpose of this supplementary appendix

This supplementary appendix is provided in response to the editorial request to supply the data underlying the analysis. The manuscript is a doctrinal and postcolonial legal study. It does not generate, collect, or analyse primary empirical data. For this type of legal research, the relevant research corpus consists of the publicly accessible legal instruments, policy documents, judicial authority, official institutional materials, and scholarly literature used to construct the analysis.

Accordingly, this appendix identifies the complete source corpus used in the manuscript and classifies each source by type, jurisdiction or institutional scope, access information, and function within the analysis. This document may be cited in the data availability statement as the complete corpus of sources underlying the study.

Recommended revised data availability statement

This article does not involve the generation, collection, or analysis of primary empirical datasets. The analysis is based exclusively on publicly available domestic and international legal instruments, judicial decisions, official government or institutional documents, and peer-reviewed academic publications. The complete corpus of legal, policy, judicial, and scholarly sources used in the study is provided in Supplementary Appendix S1.

Source corpus overview

Category	Number of sources	Description
Domestic Indonesian legal and policy materials	3	National legislation, government regulation, and AI ethics policy instrument analysed for Indonesia's TCE and AI governance framework.
International and comparative legal instruments	6	Treaties, declarations, conventions, and comparative legislation/regulation used to benchmark Indonesia's regulatory options.
Judicial authority	1	Case authority used to discuss AI authorship and the limits of conventional authorship doctrine.
Scholarly literature and institutional commentary	29	Books, peer-reviewed journal articles, edited-book chapters, and institutional commentary supporting the postcolonial, IP, AI, data-colonialism, and comparative-law analysis.
Total source corpus	39	Complete corpus corresponding to the reference list and analytical materials identified in the manuscript.

Table S1. Primary legal, policy, and judicial materials

No	Full citation	Source type	Jurisdiction / scope	Access	Use in analysis
1	Republic of Indonesia. Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 28 Tahun 2014 tentang Hak Cipta [Law No. 28 of 2014 on Copyright]. State Gazette No. 266, Supplement No. 5599. Jakarta; 2014.	Domestic legislation	Indonesia	Public legal instrument	Core domestic TCE framework; Article 38 state-custodianship model.
2	Republic of Indonesia. Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 56 Tahun 2022 tentang Kekayaan Intelektual Komunal [Government Regulation No. 56 of 2022 on Communal Intellectual Property]. Jakarta; 2022. Available from: https://jdih.dgip.go.id/produk_hukum/view/id/116/ .	Government regulation	Indonesia	Official URL	Communal IP inventory and defensive protection framework.
3	Republic of Indonesia, Ministry of Communications and Informatics. Surat Edaran Menteri Komunikasi dan Informatika Nomor 9 Tahun 2023 tentang Etika Kecerdasan Artifisial [Circular Letter No. 9 of 2023 on Artificial Intelligence Ethics]. Jakarta; 2023. Available from: https://jdih.komdigi.go.id/produk_hukum/view/id/883/ .	Government policy	Indonesia	Official URL	AI ethics baseline; used to identify absence of binding AI-specific TCE obligations.
4	World Trade Organization. Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights. Annex 1C, Marrakesh Agreement. Marrakesh, 15 April 1994. Available from: https://www.wto.org/english/docs_e/legal_e/27-trips.pdf .	International treaty	WTO	Official URL	International IP baseline and post-TRIPS context.
5	United Nations General Assembly. United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. UN Doc. A/RES/61/295; adopted 13 September 2007. Available from: https://www.un.org/development/desa/indigenouspeoples/declaration-on-the-rights-of-indigenous-peoples.html .	UN declaration	International	Official URL	Cultural sovereignty, FPIC, and indigenous rights standard.
6	International Labour Organization. Convention concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries (No. 169). Adopted 27 June 1989; entered into force 5 September 1991. Available from: https://normlex.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=NORMLEXPUB:12100:0::NO::P12100_ILO_CODE:C169 .	International convention	International	Official URL	Indigenous and tribal peoples' rights; FPIC-related comparative standard.
7	World Intellectual Property Organization. Treaty on Intellectual Property, Genetic Resources and Associated Traditional Knowledge. Geneva: WIPO; 2024. WIPO Lex No. TRT/GRATK/001. Available from: https://www.wipo.int/wipolex/en/treaties/textdetails/19849 .	International treaty	WIPO	Official URL	Disclosure-of-origin logic and global TK governance context.
8	European Parliament and Council of the European Union. Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of 13 June 2024 laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act). Official Journal of the European Union. 2024 Jul 12;L 1689:1-144. Available from: http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2024/1689/oj .	Comparative regulation	European Union	Official URL	Training-data transparency comparator; basis for proposed provenance disclosure.
9	Republic of South Africa. Intellectual Property Laws Amendment Act, No. 28 of 2013. Government Gazette No. 37148; assented to 10 December 2013.	Comparative legislation	South Africa	Public legal instrument	Comparative sui generis TCE protection model.
10	Thaler v. Vidal, 43 F.4th 1207 (Fed. Cir. 2022), cert. denied, 143 S. Ct. 1783 (2023).	Judicial decision	United States	Public case law	AI authorship and inventorship analogy; doctrinal limits of human/non-human authorship.

Table S2. Scholarly and institutional literature corpus

No	Full citation	Source type	Subject area	Access	Use in analysis
11	Abbott R. The Reasonable Robot: Artificial Intelligence and the Law. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2020. DOI: 10.1017/9781108631761.	Book	AI law	DOI	Background on AI and legal personhood/authorship debates.
12	Anaya SJ. Indigenous Peoples in International Law. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press; 2004.	Book	Indigenous rights	Publisher	Normative architecture for cultural sovereignty and collective rights.
13	Antons C. Asian Borderlands and the Legal Protection of Traditional Knowledge and Traditional Cultural Expressions. Modern Asian Studies. 2013;47(4):1403-1433. DOI: 10.1017/S0026749X12000510.	Journal article	Asian TCE law	DOI	Regional context for cross-border TCE protection.
14	Antons C. Intellectual Property Rights in Indigenous Cultural Heritage: Basic Concepts and Continuing Controversies. In: Graber CB, Kuprecht K, Lai JC, editors. International Trade in Indigenous Cultural Heritage: Legal and Policy Issues. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar; 2012. p. 144-174.	Book chapter	Indigenous heritage	Publisher	Conceptual grounding for indigenous cultural heritage and IP controversies.
15	Barelli M. Free, Prior and Informed Consent in the Aftermath of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples: Developments and Challenges Ahead. International Journal of Human Rights. 2012;16(1):1-24. DOI: 10.1080/13642987.2011.597746.	Journal article	FPIC	DOI	Operational framework for FPIC-based regulatory design.
16	Brown MF. Heritage Trouble: Recent Work on the Protection of Intangible Cultural Property. International Journal of Cultural Property. 2005;12(1):40-61. DOI: 10.1017/S0940739105050010.	Journal article	Cultural property	DOI	Caution against overbroad or administratively problematic cultural-property claims.
17	Brown MF. Who Owns Native Culture? Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press; 2003.	Book	Cultural property	Publisher	Critique of ownership and custodianship models in indigenous cultural property.
18	Chander A, Sunder M. The Romance of the Public Domain. California Law Review. 2004;92(5):1331-1373. DOI: 10.15779/Z385Q7M.	Journal article	Public domain / IP	DOI	Analysis of public-domain rhetoric and unequal appropriation.
19	Coombe RJ. The Cultural Life of Intellectual Properties: Authorship, Appropriation, and the Law. Durham (NC): Duke University Press; 1998. DOI: 10.1215/9780822382492.	Book	IP and culture	DOI	Postcolonial critique of authorship, appropriation, and alterity.
20	Couldry N, Mejias UA. Data Colonialism: Rethinking Big Data's Relation to the Contemporary Subject. Television & New Media. 2019;20(4):336-349. DOI: 10.1177/1527476418796632.	Journal article	Data colonialism	DOI	Core framework for interpreting AI training-data extraction as data colonialism.
21	Couldry N, Mejias UA. The Costs of Connection: How Data Is Colonizing Human Life and Appropriating It for Capitalism. Stanford (CA): Stanford University Press; 2019.	Book	Data colonialism	Publisher	Political-economy account of data extraction and accumulation.
22	Drahos P, Braithwaite J. Information Feudalism: Who Owns the Knowledge Economy? London: Earthscan; 2002.	Book	Global IP political economy	Publisher	TRIPS and global enclosure of knowledge resources.
23	Dutfield G. Intellectual Property, Biogenetic Resources and Traditional Knowledge. London: Earthscan; 2004.	Book	Traditional knowledge	Publisher	Traditional knowledge, benefit sharing, and biogenetic-resource governance.
24	Dutfield G. Traditional Knowledge, Intellectual Property and Pharmaceutical Innovation: What's Left to Discuss? In: David M, Halbert D, editors. The SAGE Handbook of Intellectual Property. London: SAGE; 2014. p. 649-664.	Book chapter	Traditional knowledge	Publisher	Benefit-sharing design and limits of purely defensive protection.
25	Fanon F. The Wretched of the Earth. Philcox R, translator. New York: Grove Press; 2004.	Book	Postcolonial theory	Publisher	Foundational postcolonial critique of colonial domination and its afterlives.
26	Fricke M. Epistemic Injustice: Power and the Ethics of Knowing. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2007. DOI: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198237907.001.0001.	Book	Epistemic justice	DOI	Hermeneutical injustice framework applied to IP categories.

No	Full citation	Source type	Subject area	Access	Use in analysis
27	Goss S. 25 Years in the Making: The WIPO Treaty on Intellectual Property, Genetic Resources and Associated Traditional Knowledge. Harvard International Law Journal. 2025;66(Special Edition). Available from: https://journals.law.harvard.edu/ilj/wp-content/uploads/sites/84/02_HLI_66_S_Goss.pdf .	Journal article	WIPO / TK treaty	URL	Negotiating history and analysis of the WIPO GRATK Treaty.
28	Guadamuz A. A Scanner Darkly: Copyright Liability and Exceptions in Artificial Intelligence Inputs and Outputs. GRUR International. 2024;73(2):111-127. DOI: 10.1093/grurint/ikad140.	Journal article	AI and copyright	DOI	AI training inputs/outputs and copyright liability.
29	Guadamuz A. Do Androids Dream of Electric Copyright? Comparative Analysis of Originality in Artificial Intelligence Generated Works. Intellectual Property Quarterly. 2017;(2):169-186.	Journal article	AI originality	Journal	Originality and copyrightability of AI-generated works.
30	Gupta VK. Protecting India's Traditional Knowledge. WIPO Magazine. 2011 Jun;(3):1-5. Available from: https://www.wipo.int/wipo_magazine/en/2011/03/article_0002.html .	Institutional article	Traditional knowledge	URL	India TKDL comparator for defensive documentation models.
31	Karjala DS, Paterson RK. Indigenous Heritage and Intellectual Property: A Comparative Analysis. In: Drahos P, Frankel S, editors. Indigenous Peoples' Innovation: Intellectual Property Pathways to Development. Canberra: ANU E Press; 2012. DOI: 10.22459/IPI.08.2012.	Book chapter	Comparative IP	DOI	Comparative analysis of indigenous heritage and IP pathways.
32	Mejias UA, Couldry N. Data Grab: The New Colonialism of Big Tech and How to Fight Back. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 2024.	Book	Data colonialism	Publisher	Contemporary account of Big Tech extraction and resistance.
33	Pratama BAA, et al. Perlindungan Kekayaan Intelektual Komunal Pasca Terbitnya PP Nomor 56 Tahun 2022. Jurnal De Lege Ferenda Trisakti. 2023;1(2):53-61. DOI: 10.25105/ferenda.v1i2.18276.	Journal article	Indonesian communal IP	DOI	Domestic implementation and critique of PP 56/2022.
34	Ricaurte P. Data Epistemologies, the Coloniality of Power, and Resistance. Television & New Media. 2019;20(4):350-365. DOI: 10.1177/1527476419831640.	Journal article	Data sovereignty	DOI	Decolonial and Southern data-sovereignty perspective.
35	Said EW. Orientalism. New York: Pantheon; 1978.	Book	Postcolonial theory	Publisher	Framework for analysing representation, knowledge, and colonial epistemology.
36	Spivak GC. Can the Subaltern Speak? In: Nelson C, Grossberg L, editors. Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture. Urbana (IL): University of Illinois Press; 1988. p. 271-313.	Book chapter	Postcolonial theory	Publisher	Subalternity and representational critique.
37	Sunder M. From Goods to a Good Life: Intellectual Property and Global Justice. New Haven (CT): Yale University Press; 2012.	Book	IP and global justice	Publisher	Capabilities and justice-oriented IP framework.
38	Sunder M. The Invention of Traditional Knowledge. Law and Contemporary Problems. 2007;70(2):97-124. Available from: https://scholarship.law.duke.edu/lcp/vol70/iss2/5/ .	Journal article	Traditional knowledge	URL	Critical analysis of traditional knowledge as a legal category.
39	Von Lewinski S, editor. Indigenous Heritage and Intellectual Property: Genetic Resources, Traditional Knowledge and Folklore. 2nd ed. Alphen aan den Rijn: Kluwer Law International; 2008.	Edited book	Indigenous heritage / IP	Publisher	Comparative legal framework for TK, folklore, and genetic resources.

Reproducibility and access note

The study can be reproduced at the level appropriate for doctrinal legal research by consulting the corpus listed in Tables S1 and S2 and following the interpretive method described in the manuscript. The corpus is limited to public legal, policy, judicial, institutional, and scholarly sources. Where the manuscript provides DOI or URL information, the same access information is reproduced in this appendix. Books and edited volumes without DOI or URL information in the manuscript are identified by publisher details.

Negative data statement

No anonymised, de-identified, restricted, proprietary, confidential, interview, survey, ethnographic, experimental, observational, or human-subject dataset exists beyond the public source corpus identified in this appendix. No personal data, animal-subject data, or clinical data formed part of the research materials.

Author confirmation

The author confirms that the materials listed above constitute the complete source corpus underlying the analysis in the manuscript. The appendix is intended to clarify the meaning of 'data' for this doctrinal and theoretical legal study and to support transparent editorial and peer-review assessment.

Suggested citation of this appendix

Supplementary Appendix S1. Complete Corpus of Legal, Policy, Judicial, and Scholarly Sources. Accompanying: Cultural Sovereignty in the Age of AI: A Postcolonial Critique of Intellectual Property Frameworks for Indonesian Traditional Arts.