INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW

VOLUME 5 AND ISSUE 9 OF 2025

INSTITUTE OF LEGAL EDUCATION

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW

APIS – 3920 – 0001 | ISSN - 2583-2344

(Open Access Journal)

Journal's Home Page – https://ijlr.iledu.in/

Journal's Editorial Page - https://ijlr.iledu.in/editorial-board/

Volume 5 and Issue 9 of 2025 (Access Full Issue on - https://ijlr.iledu.in/volume-5-and-issue-10-of-2025/)

Publisher

Prasanna S,

Chairman of Institute of Legal Education

No. 08, Arul Nagar, Seera Thoppu,

Maudhanda Kurichi, Srirangam,

Tiruchirappalli – 620102

Phone : +91 94896 71437 - info@iledu.in / Chairman@iledu.in

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW [IJLR – IF SCORE – 7.58]

VOLUME 5 AND ISSUE 10 OF 2025

APIS – 3920 - 0001 *(and)* ISSN - 2583-2344

Published by

Institute of Legal Education

https://iledu.in

PATENT PROTECTION FOR BIOTECHNOLOGICAL INNOVATION: BALANCING INNOVATION AND ACCESS TO PUBLIC HEALTH

AUTHOR - AASTHA CHAUHAN, AMITY LAW SCHOOL, AMITY UNIVERSITY UTTAR PRADESH

BEST CITATION - AASTHA CHAUHAN, PATENT PROTECTION FOR BIOTECHNOLOGICAL INNOVATION: BALANCING INNOVATION AND ACCESS TO PUBLIC HEALTH, *INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW (IJLR)*, 5 (10) OF 2025, PG. 636-644, APIS – 3920 – 0001 & ISSN - 2583-2344.

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Biotechnology has revolutionized modern healthcare by enabling the development of advanced medical technologies, including genetically engineered vaccines, targeted drug therapies, and diagnostic tools. This sector holds immense promise for addressing global health challenges, such as communicable and non-communicable diseases, genetic disorders, and pandemics. Breakthroughs in genetic engineering, molecular biology, and bioinformatics have allowed for personalized medicine and regenerative therapies, positioning biotechnology as a cornerstone of 21st-century healthcare systems.

Incentivizing such innovation requires significant investment in research and development (R&D), which is often facilitated by a strong patent regime. Patents grant innovators a time-limited monopoly over the commercial use of their inventions, allowing them to recoup R&D costs and profit from their innovations. This legal exclusivity, typically lasting 20 years from the date of filing, is seen as a key mechanism for promoting technological advancement in the life sciences and pharmaceutical sectors.[635]

However, while patents can stimulate innovation, they also raise critical concerns regarding affordability and accessibility, especially in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs). Patent holders can control pricing and production, which may result in prohibitively expensive medical treatments that remain inaccessible to large segments of the global population. This imbalance disproportionately affects public health in poorer nations, where the burden of disease is high and access to advanced therapeutics is limited. For example, the pricing of patented antiretroviral drugs in the early 2000s significantly hampered HIV/AIDS treatment efforts in sub-Saharan Africa.[636]

Therefore, the central dilemma facing policymakers is how to balance the legitimate interests of innovators with the urgent public health need for affordable access to life-saving biotechnological products. International legal instruments like the TRIPS Agreement attempt to address this tension by providing flexibilities such as compulsory licensing, but the real-world application of such tools remains uneven. It is crucial to explore national legal frameworks and judicial approaches to determine how effectively they mitigate the negative consequences of exclusive patent rights while fostering an environment conducive to continued innovation.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

The legal framework for biotechnology patents can ensure innovation by granting inventors exclusive rights over their inventions, thereby providing a financial incentive to invest in costly

[635] Watal, J. (2001). *Intellectual Property Rights in the WTO and Developing Countries*. Kluwer Law International, p. 65.

[636] 'Intellectual Property Rights and Access to Medicines', WHO Policy Perspectives on Medicines, No. 3, World Health Organization, 2006.

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW [IJLR – IF SCORE – 7.58]
VOLUME 5 AND ISSUE 10 OF 2025
APIS – 3920 - 0001 *(and)* ISSN - 2583-2344
Published by
Institute of Legal Education
https://iledu.in

and high-risk research and development. Patents serve as a reward mechanism for scientific progress, allowing companies and researchers to commercialize new drugs, diagnostics, and medical technologies. In the context of biotechnology, this exclusivity is particularly important, as the development of biologics and gene-based therapies often involves extensive regulatory scrutiny, complex manufacturing processes, and high failure rates. By offering a period of market exclusivity, the patent system encourages continued investment in cutting-edge medical solutions that can significantly improve public health outcomes.

However, to avoid compromising access to essential medicines, the legal framework must incorporate safeguards and public interest mechanisms that limit the negative effects of monopoly rights. Provisions such as **compulsory licensing**, **parallel imports**, and **exemptions for research use**—as seen in the Indian Patents Act, 1970—help strike a balance between innovation and accessibility. Additionally, the adoption of **Section 3(d)** in India prevents the patenting of minor modifications of known substances, curbing the practice of evergreening and promoting the availability of affordable generics. Internationally, the TRIPS Agreement and the Doha Declaration provide legal flexibilities for member countries to prioritize public health over strict patent enforcement when necessary. A balanced legal framework thus integrates both innovation incentives and equitable access policies, ensuring that biotechnological advancements benefit all sections of society.

1.3 Literature Review

Watal, J. (2001), *Intellectual Property Rights in the WTO and Developing Countries*

Jayashree Watal's analysis provides a foundational perspective on how the TRIPS Agreement affects innovation and access to essential medicines in developing countries. She argues that while patent protection encourages technological advancement, it often disproportionately benefits pharmaceutical companies in developed countries. This imbalance can lead to unaffordable drug prices in poorer nations, severely limiting access to life-saving treatments. Watal underscores the need for differential implementation strategies that account for the unique socio-economic conditions of each country.[637]

A significant contribution of Watal's work is her emphasis on the built-in TRIPS flexibilities, such as compulsory licensing and parallel imports. These provisions allow countries to legally bypass patent rights in public health emergencies, enabling access to generic versions of patented drugs. However, Watal warns that many developing countries lack the legal expertise or political strength to implement these flexibilities effectively. She calls for capacity building and international cooperation to empower such nations in using the TRIPS framework to their advantage.[638]

Correa, C. M. (2000), *Integrating Public Health Concerns into Patent Legislation in Developing Countries*

Carlos Correa's policy guide focuses on the legislative tools that developing nations can use to safeguard public health within the confines of TRIPS. He argues that overly broad patent protections can create monopolies that reduce competition and drive up the cost of essential medicines. Correa advocates for strict patentability criteria—such as requiring a significant inventive step—to prevent the patenting of minor modifications to existing drugs, a practice often referred to as "evergreening."[639]

Correa also promotes the use of compulsory licensing, especially in situations involving public health crises like HIV/AIDS or pandemics. He highlights how countries can design their patent laws to permit the manufacture or

[637] Watal, J. (2001). *Intellectual Property Rights in the WTO and Developing Countries*, p. 98.
[638] Ibid., p. 124.
[639] Correa, C. M. (2000). *Integrating Public Health Concerns into Patent Legislation in Developing Countries*, p. 46.

import of affordable generics without violating international obligations. His work emphasizes that public health exceptions under TRIPS should be interpreted broadly to prioritize the right to health over commercial interests.[640]

Articles from WHO, WIPO, and WTO Reports on TRIPS and Access to Medicines

Reports from the World Health Organization (WHO) emphasize that high drug prices, often resulting from patent monopolies, are a major barrier to healthcare in developing countries. The WHO has consistently highlighted the need for global mechanisms that balance intellectual property rights with the right to health. For instance, its 2006 report stresses the importance of public sector involvement in pharmaceutical innovation to offset private sector biases toward profit-driven research.[641]

The WTO and WIPO also acknowledge the tension between intellectual property and access to medicines, particularly through the Doha Declaration on the TRIPS Agreement and Public Health. This declaration affirms the right of WTO members to prioritize public health and use TRIPS flexibilities when necessary. WIPO has further supported this stance by encouraging knowledge-sharing frameworks and voluntary patent pools to enhance access to technology in the global South.[642]

1.4 Research Objectives

1. To analyze the existing patent law framework governing biotechnology

Understanding the legal framework surrounding biotechnology patents is crucial, given the sector's increasing role in pharmaceuticals, diagnostics, and public health. The TRIPS Agreement under the World Trade Organization provides the global baseline for patent laws, mandating a 20-year protection period for inventions, including biotechnological products and processes. However, this uniform requirement often fails to consider the socio-economic disparities between countries, especially when it comes to public access to patented innovations.[643] National legislations have tried to interpret and implement TRIPS in ways that align with their developmental priorities, but inconsistencies persist in balancing innovation with equitable access.

In the Indian context, the Patents Act of 1970, as amended post-TRIPS in 2005, reflects the country's cautious approach to patenting in sensitive fields such as biotechnology. For instance, Section 3(b) and 3(d) of the Act restrict the patenting of inventions that are contrary to public order or mere incremental innovations, respectively. These provisions have been instrumental in preventing monopolies over essential drugs. Yet, India's framework also faces challenges in encouraging investment in biotech innovation due to concerns over weak patent enforcement and regulatory uncertainty.[644] This objective involves a detailed doctrinal analysis of both international and domestic legal texts governing biotech patents.

2. To assess how international and Indian laws balance innovation with public health needs

Balancing the economic incentive to innovate with the moral imperative of ensuring public health is a central tension in intellectual property law. Internationally, this balance is partially addressed through TRIPS flexibilities, including compulsory licensing and the Bolar exemption. The Doha Declaration on TRIPS and Public Health (2001) reaffirmed that countries have the right to protect public health and promote access to medicines, particularly in emergencies. Nevertheless, the effectiveness of these provisions depends heavily on a country's legal infrastructure and political will to implement them.[645]

[640] Ibid., p. 73.
[641] World Health Organization. (2006). *Intellectual Property Rights and Access to Medicines: An Overview of Key Issues* (Policy Perspectives on Medicines No. 3), p. 12.
[642] World Trade Organization. (2001). *Doha Declaration on the TRIPS Agreement and Public Health*; World Intellectual Property Organization. (2013). *Report on Patent-Related Flexibilities*, p. 6.
[643] World Trade Organization. (1994). *TRIPS Agreement, Articles 27 and 33*.
[644] The Patents Act, 1970, §§ 3(b), 3(d) (India).
[645] World Trade Organization. (2001). *Declaration on the TRIPS Agreement and Public Health* (Doha Declaration).

India has actively used TRIPS flexibilities to safeguard public health, most notably in the **Novartis v. Union of India** case, where the Supreme Court denied patent protection for a cancer drug on the grounds of evergreening. This judgment underscored India's commitment to health equity while remaining TRIPS-compliant. However, international pressure from pharmaceutical lobbies and trade partners continues to influence India's IP regime. Thus, assessing how these legal systems function in practice requires not just a review of statutes but also a consideration of institutional behavior and socio-economic contexts.[646]

3. To study case laws and their impact on access to healthcare

Judicial decisions have significantly shaped the contours of patent law in relation to healthcare. Cases such as **Novartis AG v. Union of India** (2013) and **Bayer Corporation v. Natco Pharma Ltd.** (2012) have reinforced the notion that patents should not obstruct access to essential medicines. In the Novartis case, the Indian Supreme Court's interpretation of Section 3(d) set a global precedent by denying patent protection for a modified version of the anti-cancer drug Glivec, thus prioritizing affordability over commercial interest.[647] These rulings have had both legal and political implications, strengthening India's stance as a pro-public health jurisdiction in global IP debates.

On the international front, case law from jurisdictions such as South Africa and Brazil has also emphasized the right to health over strict patent enforcement. These cases often emerge in response to HIV/AIDS or other public health crises and showcase how judicial intervention can correct market imbalances. The study of such precedents helps illuminate the evolving legal standards that courts use to weigh innovation incentives against human rights obligations. By analyzing these judgments, the research aims to understand how law, as interpreted by courts, mediates the patent-access divide in real-world scenarios.[648]

1.5 Research Questions

- How do patent laws affect biotechnological innovation?
- What international provisions exist to support public health under patent regimes?
- How has India addressed these concerns legislatively and judicially?

1.6 Hypothesis

The current legal framework governing biotechnology patents is primarily structured to incentivize innovation by granting exclusive rights to inventors. This exclusivity, provided for a period of 20 years under the TRIPS Agreement, is intended to allow innovators to recoup research and development costs and earn profits, thus encouraging continued investment in scientific advancement. Particularly in the biotech sector, where the development of new drugs, diagnostic tools, and treatments involves significant financial and temporal investment, patent protection is seen as a crucial driver of progress. However, this innovation-centric approach often overlooks the social implications of limiting access to the patented products, especially in healthcare.

This imbalance becomes evident when life-saving treatments become inaccessible due to high prices driven by patent monopolies. In low- and middle-income countries, public healthcare systems often struggle to afford patented medications, leaving large segments of the population without essential care. While international instruments like the Doha Declaration reaffirm a state's right to use TRIPS flexibilities such as compulsory licensing to address health emergencies, these mechanisms are often underutilized due to political pressure, lack of technical capacity, or trade-related constraints. As a result, the

[646] Novartis AG v. Union of India, (2013) 6 SCC 1.
[647] Ibid.
[648] Bayer Corporation v. Natco Pharma Ltd., (2012) IPAB Decision No. 45/2013.

current framework disproportionately benefits patent holders—typically large pharmaceutical corporations—while compromising the ability of states to fulfill their citizens' right to health.

Moreover, national laws, including those in India, attempt to strike a balance through provisions like Section 3(d) of the Indian Patents Act, which prohibits the patenting of new forms of known substances unless they show significantly enhanced efficacy. Despite such efforts, implementation gaps and conflicting policy priorities can undermine the intended public health safeguards. Judicial interventions, as seen in landmark cases like *Novartis v. Union of India*, have played a pivotal role in defending public interest, but relying on courts alone is insufficient. A more holistic reform of the legal framework is needed—one that embeds equitable access into the very architecture of patent laws rather than treating it as an exception to the norm.

1.7 Research Methodology

The research adopts a **doctrinal approach**, focusing on the critical examination of existing statutes, international agreements, and judicial decisions that shape the legal landscape of biotechnology patents. By systematically analyzing instruments such as the TRIPS Agreement, the Indian Patents Act, and related national laws, the study aims to understand how legal texts conceptualize the balance between innovation and public health. This method allows for a structured interpretation of the legal provisions that govern patentability, scope of protection, and available flexibilities. The doctrinal analysis helps uncover the legislative intent behind key provisions, such as Section 3(d) of the Indian Patents Act, and how such clauses are employed to prevent practices like evergreening and ensure public interest is served.

Complementing this is a **comparative approach**, which enables the study to evaluate how different jurisdictions interpret and apply patent law principles in the context of biotechnology. By comparing legal frameworks and case laws from India with those from other countries—such as the United States, Brazil, and South Africa—the research identifies best practices and policy gaps. This approach is particularly valuable in understanding the effectiveness of TRIPS flexibilities and how various legal systems reconcile the conflict between intellectual property rights and the right to health. Through this comparative lens, the study provides a more nuanced view of how different legal environments either facilitate or hinder access to essential healthcare innovations.

Chapter II: International Scenario

TRIPS Agreement (WTO) – Articles 27, 30, 31 on patentability and compulsory licensing

The **TRIPS Agreement** (Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights), established under the World Trade Organization (WTO) [649] in 1994, is the foundational international framework for patent protection. It sets minimum standards for intellectual property (IP) across member countries, including biotechnology patents. **Article 27** of the TRIPS Agreement requires WTO member states to grant patents for any invention, whether in biotechnology or other fields, as long as the invention meets the criteria of **novelty**, **inventive step**, and **industrial applicability**. This broad patentability mandate ensures that all technological innovations, including biotechnological advancements such as new drugs, genetic modifications, and agricultural innovations, are protected under the patent system. However, this comprehensive patentability approach has drawn significant criticism, especially concerning its impact on **public health**. In particular, the granting of patents for life-saving medications and biotechnological inventions can lead to monopolies that restrict access to affordable healthcare, particularly in developing countries. Critics argue that the exclusivity granted by patents can make essential medicines

[649] World Trade Organization. (1994). *TRIPS Agreement*, Articles 27, 30, and 31.

prohibitively expensive, thereby exacerbating health inequalities, particularly in resource-poor settings.

In response to these concerns, **Articles 30 and 31** of the TRIPS Agreement provide important safeguards to allow countries to balance patent protection with public health needs. **Article 30** permits WTO members to introduce **limited exceptions** to patent rights. These exceptions can be crafted in a way that serves the **public interest**, such as allowing for the production of generic versions of essential medicines without infringing on the patent holder's rights. This flexibility is crucial for public health policies that prioritize the availability and affordability of medicines. **Article 31**, in particular, addresses the issue of **compulsory licensing**—a mechanism that allows a government to override a patent holder's exclusive rights in specific situations, such as public health emergencies or when medicines are not sufficiently available at affordable prices. Under this provision, a government can give permission to a third party to produce or import the patented product without the consent of the patent holder, thus ensuring the availability of life-saving treatments during crises such as pandemics or natural disasters. These provisions are vital in maintaining a balance between encouraging innovation through patent protection and ensuring **access to essential medicines** for all populations, particularly in times of medical emergencies or health crises where the need for rapid access to treatments outweighs the rights of patent holders. The TRIPS framework, therefore, allows flexibility in patent law that can be strategically utilized by member states to protect public health without undermining the foundational goals of intellectual property protection.

Doha Declaration (2001) – Affirms the right to protect public health

The **Doha Declaration** (2001) is a pivotal statement adopted by the members of the **World Trade Organization (WTO)** that directly addresses the intersection of intellectual property rights and public health. The Declaration emerged as a response to concerns regarding the **TRIPS Agreement**'s potential to undermine access to essential medicines, particularly in low- and middle-income countries where the costs of patented medicines are often unaffordable. The Declaration emphasizes that **public health concerns** should be prioritized over commercial interests in situations where the two conflict. It clearly affirms that **TRIPS** should not prevent WTO member countries from implementing measures aimed at safeguarding **public health**. This includes the ability of governments to utilize **compulsory licensing** and other **flexibilities** within the TRIPS framework to ensure access to affordable medicines, even if such measures undermine the exclusive patent rights of pharmaceutical companies. The Declaration was primarily a response to the escalating cost of **HIV/AIDS treatments** in developing countries, which were exacerbated by patent monopolies, and it aimed to protect vulnerable populations by ensuring that the rights of patients to access life-saving medications were not subordinated to the rights of patent holders.

In particular, the **Doha Declaration** provided clarity on the **right of WTO members** to use TRIPS flexibilities like **compulsory licensing** to address public health crises. These measures allow governments to bypass patent rights temporarily and authorize the production or importation of generic versions of patented medicines, typically in the case of public health emergencies. This flexibility is crucial for ensuring that medicines are affordable and accessible during pandemics or health emergencies. Notably, the Doha Declaration led to **India's** decision to adopt policies that align with these flexibilities, particularly through the **Indian Patents Act**, which enables the use of compulsory licenses in specific situations. The Declaration's legacy has been instrumental in reshaping the global conversation about the balance between protecting intellectual property and ensuring **global access to medicines**. It provided a robust legal and policy

framework for countries to defend their public health interests while remaining in compliance with international trade obligations. In this way, the Doha Declaration helped reinforce the international consensus that public health takes precedence over commercial interests, contributing to the development of **health-oriented IP policies** and facilitating greater **advocacy for access to essential treatments** across the globe.[650]

Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) – Sovereignty over genetic resources

The **Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)**, adopted in **1992** at the **Earth Summit** in Rio de Janeiro, stands as one of the most significant international treaties focused on the preservation of biodiversity and the sustainable use of biological resources. The CBD introduced a crucial legal principle: the **sovereignty of nations over their genetic resources**. This principle holds that countries possess the exclusive right to control access to their genetic resources, including plants, animals, and microorganisms, which have valuable applications in biotechnology, agriculture, and pharmaceuticals. The CBD emphasizes that these resources must be used in ways that respect the rights of local and indigenous communities, ensuring that they receive benefits from the use of their biodiversity. This framework promotes the **fair and equitable sharing of benefits** arising from the utilization of genetic resources, which includes not only monetary compensation but also knowledge sharing, research collaborations, and capacity-building initiatives. By recognizing national sovereignty over genetic resources, the CBD establishes a critical safeguard against the misappropriation or misuse of biodiversity, ensuring that the exploitation of these resources does not occur at the expense of the countries that host them.

In the realm of **biotechnology patenting**, the CBD plays a fundamental role by ensuring that the patenting of biotechnological inventions derived from genetic resources cannot occur without the **prior informed consent** (PIC) of the country that provided the resources. This provision is vital to preventing **biopiracy**, a situation where companies or researchers from industrialized countries exploit genetic resources from developing nations without providing fair compensation or recognition. The CBD's emphasis on **prior informed consent** and the **benefit-sharing mechanism** ensures that countries can negotiate the terms of access to their genetic resources and control how these resources are used in commercial applications, such as the development of drugs or genetically modified organisms (GMOs). This framework fosters a more equitable global system by ensuring that developing countries are not exploited for their rich biodiversity, while also encouraging international collaboration in the biotechnological sector. As a result, the CBD has become a cornerstone of the international regulatory landscape, influencing both national laws and multilateral agreements governing the use of genetic resources in biotechnology and related industries.[651]

Nagoya Protocol – Fair sharing of benefits arising from genetic resources

The **Nagoya Protocol**, adopted in **2010** as a supplementary agreement to the **Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)**, further solidifies the framework for the **fair and equitable sharing of benefits** derived from genetic resources. The protocol was designed to operationalize the CBD's principles, specifically addressing issues of **access to genetic resources** and **benefit-sharing** in the context of biotechnological innovation. One of the core provisions of the Nagoya Protocol is the requirement for countries to ensure that **prior informed consent (PIC)** is obtained from the country of origin before genetic resources are accessed for research or commercial purposes. This ensures that the countries providing these

[650] World Trade Organization. (2001). *Doha Declaration on the TRIPS Agreement and Public Health*, WTO Ministerial Declaration, 14 November 2001.

[651] Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity. (1992). *Convention on Biological Diversity*, Article 15

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW [IJLR – IF SCORE – 7.58]

VOLUME 5 AND ISSUE 10 OF 2025

APIS – 3920 - 0001 *(and)* ISSN - 2583-2344

Published by

Institute of Legal Education

https://iledu.in

resources retain control over how their genetic resources are used, thus preventing biopiracy and ensuring that the **rights of indigenous communities** and local stakeholders are respected. The **mutually agreed terms (MAT)** that are negotiated under the protocol further ensure that any benefits arising from the use of genetic resources, including financial gains and knowledge sharing, are equitably distributed between the resource provider and the parties benefiting from the research or commercialization.

For biotechnology, the **Nagoya Protocol** has particular relevance, as many biotechnological innovations, such as new drugs, agricultural products, and genetically modified organisms (GMOs), are derived from genetic resources like plants, animals, and microorganisms. The protocol mandates that any benefits, including profits from the commercialization of patented biotechnological products, must be shared with the countries and communities that provided the original genetic resources. This framework helps counteract the historical exploitation of **genetic resources** from developing countries, ensuring that the nations that contribute valuable biodiversity are compensated for their role in scientific and industrial advancements. The protocol also facilitates international collaboration by creating a legally binding framework for **access to genetic resources** and ensuring that **biotechnology companies** adhere to ethical standards in their dealings with countries rich in biodiversity. As such, the Nagoya Protocol is a crucial instrument in promoting **fair trade** in biological resources and preventing the **misappropriation** of genetic material for commercial gain without equitable compensation.[652]

Certainly! Here is the expanded version of the statement on the **Role of WHO, WIPO, and UNDP in framing public health-oriented IP policy**, with proper footnoting:

Role of WHO, WIPO, and UNDP in framing public health-oriented IP policy

The **World Health Organization (WHO)**, **World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO)**, and **United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)** play essential roles in the development of global policies that align **intellectual property rights (IPR)** with **public health objectives**. WHO's primary focus is on advancing global public health by ensuring that medicines and medical technologies are affordable and accessible, especially in low- and middle-income countries. WHO advocates for the use of **TRIPS flexibilities**, such as **compulsory licensing** and **parallel imports**, to enhance access to essential medicines. Through its **Global Strategy and Plan of Action on Public Health, Innovation, and Intellectual Property**, WHO provides guidance to governments on how to integrate public health concerns into national IP frameworks. The organization's efforts are aimed at ensuring that **IP laws** do not become barriers to public health but instead serve as tools for innovation while guaranteeing the accessibility and affordability of essential medicines. WHO also plays a significant role in promoting collaboration between governments and international organizations to foster more **equitable access** to life-saving treatments, ensuring that public health takes precedence over commercial interests in the global IP landscape.

In contrast, **WIPO** oversees the global governance of the intellectual property system. WIPO's role is critical in shaping international **IP policy** while ensuring that **IP laws** contribute to the **development goals** of countries. One of its central mandates is to ensure that the enforcement of intellectual property rights does not undermine the ability of countries to meet their public health needs. **WIPO's Development Agenda**, which was adopted in 2007, emphasizes the need for **balanced IP policies** that account for the social, economic, and public health needs of nations, particularly developing countries. WIPO has supported initiatives that focus on the intersection of

[652] Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity. (2010). *Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from Their Utilization.*

intellectual property and public health, such as promoting the use of **IP flexibilities** within the **TRIPS** framework to support access to medicines and the transfer of technology for health innovation. The organization has also provided technical assistance and training to governments, enabling them to develop IP strategies that promote both innovation and public welfare. Through these efforts, WIPO ensures that the international IP system is not only an instrument for commercial gain but also a mechanism for **fostering innovation** that benefits **global public health**.

The **UNDP** plays a significant role in **sustainable development** by ensuring that IP policies contribute to achieving the **Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)**, particularly in the areas of **poverty reduction** and **health equity**. UNDP collaborates with countries to design policies that promote innovation while addressing public health challenges. The UNDP's focus on **inclusive development** aims to ensure that **IP laws** are designed to reduce inequalities and ensure that the benefits of **biotechnological innovations** are widely distributed. UNDP supports the creation of frameworks that ensure access to affordable medicines, particularly in developing countries, by working on **capacity-building initiatives** and providing technical assistance to governments to help them use **IPR** in a way that balances economic development with the needs of their populations. By fostering the role of **IP as a tool for development**, UNDP works to ensure that nations use their intellectual property systems to address **global health issues** in a way that promotes **equity** and **accessibility** for all.

Together, these organizations—**WHO**, **WIPO**, and **UNDP**—play a vital role in ensuring that international **IP systems** not only protect intellectual property but also promote global **health equity**. Their collaborative efforts continue to influence international IP frameworks, ensuring that innovation is balanced with **public health priorities**. Through their work, they advocate for policies that facilitate the development of technologies and medicines that are accessible to everyone, especially in resource-poor settings, and **foster a more inclusive, health-oriented global IP system.**[653]

[653] World Health Organization. (2008). *Global Strategy and Plan of Action on Public Health, Innovation, and Intellectual Property*. Geneva: WHO.