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

VOLUME 5 AND ISSUE 13 OF 2025

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

Published by

Institute of Legal Education

https://iledu.in

DIGITAL BIOPIRACY: GENETIC DATA, CLOUD DATABASES, AND THE RISE OF INVISIBLE APPROPRIATION

AUTHOR - ADITI RAJ, STUDENT AT AMITY UNIVERSITY, PATNA

BEST CITATION - ADITI RAJ, DIGITAL BIOPIRACY: GENETIC DATA, CLOUD DATABASES, AND THE RISE OF INVISIBLE APPROPRIATION, *INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW (IJLR)*, 5 (13) OF 2025, PG. 533-538, APIS – 3920 – 0001 & ISSN - 2583-2344.

Abstract

The digitization of genetic information has revolutionized biological research and global innovation but has also given rise to a new and less visible form of exploitation—**digital biopiracy**. Unlike traditional biopiracy, which involves the physical appropriation of biological materials, digital biopiracy exploits **genetic sequences and traditional knowledge stored in cloud databases**, often without authorization, compensation, or recognition. The capacity to download, replicate, and modify genetic data across borders has created profound legal, ethical, and jurisdictional dilemmas. This paper explores the evolution of digital biopiracy, the gaps in existing international legal frameworks such as the **TRIPS Agreement**, the **Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)**, and the **Nagoya Protocol**, and the tension between open-access scientific data and sovereign rights over genetic resources. It further examines the role of emerging technologies—**artificial intelligence (AI)** and **blockchain**—in reshaping governance and offers policy recommendations for equitable, transparent, and ethically responsible digital genetic data management.

Keywords - Digital Biopiracy, Genetic Data, Intellectual Property Rights, Cloud Databases, Artificial Intelligence, Biodiversity Governance, Data Sovereignty, Biotechnology, Ethical Governance, Global IP Law

1. Introduction

The 21st century has witnessed an exponential increase in the digitization of biological data, resulting from advancements in genomics, synthetic biology, and bioinformatics. Genetic sequencing technologies can now decode an organism's genome within hours, producing massive datasets that are stored and shared globally through digital databases. While such developments have accelerated scientific discovery, they have also created an ethical and legal vacuum regarding ownership, access, and benefit-sharing.

Digital biopiracy refers to the **unauthorized acquisition, storage, and commercial exploitation of digital genetic data** derived from biological resources, often belonging to indigenous communities or biodiversity-rich nations. The issue transcends traditional notions of biopiracy, as digital information can be transferred and monetized without physical possession of the resource itself. This phenomenon challenges the very foundations of international intellectual property (IP) regimes, which were designed to regulate tangible inventions rather than digitized biological data.

The dilemma is accentuated by the rapid evolution of **cloud storage systems** and **global bioinformatics databases** like GenBank, the European Nucleotide Archive (ENA), and the DNA Data Bank of Japan (DDBJ), which freely share genetic information worldwide. While intended for scientific collaboration, these databases have become sites of potential exploitation, blurring the boundaries between open science and commercial appropriation.

2. The Concept and Evolution of Biopiracy

2.1 Traditional Biopiracy

The term "biopiracy" historically refers to the misappropriation of biological materials or traditional knowledge without proper authorization or benefit-sharing. Classic examples include the patenting of **neem**, **turmeric**, and **basmati rice**—cases where corporations claimed ownership over resources and knowledge that were already part of indigenous traditions. The ethical criticism of biopiracy lies in its colonial continuity: it replicates historical patterns of resource extraction, now through intellectual property systems rather than territorial conquest.

2.2 Emergence of Digital Biopiracy

With the advent of **next-generation sequencing (NGS)** and **bioinformatics**, genetic information has become a valuable digital commodity. Instead of collecting plants or organisms, researchers can now access DNA sequences online, often detached from their geographic or cultural origins. This **dematerialization of biological resources** has transformed the landscape of biopiracy—making it faster, less visible, and harder to regulate.

Digital biopiracy thus refers to the **appropriation of genetic information in silico**, often facilitated by global databases that lack mechanisms for tracking consent, provenance, or benefit-sharing.

3. Global Legal Frameworks and the Regulatory Gap

3.1 The TRIPS Agreement (1995)

The **Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS)** under the World Trade Organization established minimum standards for patent protection across all technologies. However, TRIPS does not specifically address digital genetic data. Article 27(3)(b) allows exclusion from patentability for "plants and animals other than microorganisms," yet remains silent on **genetic sequences stored digitally**.

This legal silence has enabled entities to claim patents on digital gene sequences without disclosing their biological origins, effectively bypassing sovereign control over biodiversity.

3.2 The Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), 1992

The **CBD** recognized, for the first time, the **sovereign rights of states over biological resources**. It emphasized fair and equitable **Access and Benefit-Sharing (ABS)** principles. However, the CBD was negotiated before the digital revolution; thus, it primarily concerns **tangible biological materials**. As a result, digital genetic data (often referred to as **Digital Sequence Information**, or DSI) falls outside its current scope, leading to regulatory ambiguity.

3.3 The Nagoya Protocol (2010)

The **Nagoya Protocol** operationalized the CBD's objectives by introducing procedural requirements such as **Prior Informed Consent (PIC)** and **Mutually Agreed Terms (MAT)**. Yet, its implementation remains limited to physical resources. The question of whether DSI constitutes a "genetic resource" under Article 2 remains contested, leaving room for digital misappropriation.

3.4 The Data Governance Dilemma

Existing frameworks focus on **biological material transfer**, but not **information transfer**. Cloud-based genomic databases facilitate cross-border data sharing, making enforcement of ABS obligations practically impossible. This creates a **regulatory vacuum** where digital genetic data can be mined, patented, and commercialized without accountability.

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW [IJLR – IF SCORE – 7.58]
VOLUME 5 AND ISSUE 13 OF 2025
APIS – 3920 - 0001 *(and)* ISSN - 2583-2344
Published by
Institute of Legal Education
https://iledu.in

4. The Mechanics of Digital Biopiracy

4.1 From Genome to Database

Modern biopiracy no longer requires physical specimens. Once an organism's DNA is sequenced, its genetic code is uploaded to a digital repository. Corporations or researchers can then **download, modify, or synthesize** the genetic sequence using lab-based DNA synthesis technologies—completely circumventing the original country's legal jurisdiction.

4.2 Cloud Databases and Open Access

Public databases like **GenBank** are built on the ethos of open science, promoting free data exchange. However, open access can inadvertently facilitate exploitation. When genetic data are separated from their **metadata**—information about geographic origin, traditional use, or community ownership—provenance becomes untraceable, allowing "invisible appropriation."

4.3 Commercialization and Synthetic Biology

Synthetic biology enables the **recreation or redesign of genes** without direct extraction from nature. A corporation could use digital sequences from an open database to manufacture bioproducts such as enzymes, vaccines, or biofuels, often patented as novel inventions. This creates a paradox: companies can commercialize synthetic versions of naturally occurring genes without technically "using" the biological resource itself—escaping the scope of ABS and biopiracy laws.

5. Ethical Dimensions of Digital Biopiracy

Digital biopiracy challenges fundamental notions of **justice, consent, and ownership**. Indigenous and local communities, who have preserved biological diversity for centuries, are often excluded from decision-making processes and economic benefits.

5.1 Knowledge Inequity

The concentration of technological capacity and computational resources in the Global North creates a **digital divide**, enabling developed nations and corporations to exploit genetic data originating from biodiversity-rich developing countries.

5.2 Decontextualization of Traditional Knowledge

When genetic sequences are stripped of cultural and ecological context, the **holistic knowledge systems** of indigenous communities are reduced to mere data points—an epistemic injustice that erases cultural meaning and contribution.

5.3 Ethical Governance and Consent

Ethical governance demands **free, prior, and informed consent (FPIC)** for the use of genetic and traditional knowledge, even in digital form. However, existing consent frameworks are ill-suited for online, transnational data exchanges.

6. Jurisdictional and Governance Challenges

6.1 Extraterritoriality of Data

Once genetic data are uploaded to cloud platforms, they transcend territorial boundaries. Data servers may be located in one country, users in another, and beneficiaries in a third. This raises **complex jurisdictional questions** about which nation's laws apply.

6.2 Intellectual Property vs. Sovereign Rights

Patent offices worldwide do not require disclosure of the source of genetic information. Consequently, corporations can obtain patents based on digital sequences without revealing their origin, undermining **state sovereignty** and **indigenous rights**.

6.3 Enforcement and Monitoring

Traditional enforcement models—based on material tracking—are ineffective in the digital realm. The absence of global digital traceability standards further compounds enforcement difficulties.

7. Emerging Technologies and Their Dual Role

7.1 Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Genetic Prediction

AI is increasingly used to analyze genomic datasets, identify patterns, and even predict genetic traits or disease predispositions. While AI accelerates biomedical research, it also magnifies the potential for **data-driven biopiracy**. Algorithms trained on global genetic databases can generate synthetic sequences mimicking natural genomes, making it nearly impossible to determine origin or authenticity.

Moreover, AI-generated bio-inventions raise questions about **inventorship and accountability**. If an algorithm designs a new genetic variant based on public data, who owns the resulting IP? The absence of legal recognition for algorithmic creativity complicates ownership and ethical responsibility.

7.2 Blockchain for Transparency and Provenance

Conversely, **blockchain technology** offers potential solutions. Its immutable, distributed ledger can record the provenance of genetic data, ensuring traceability and consent verification. Smart contracts can automate **benefit-sharing agreements**, releasing payments or access rights once certain conditions are met. Initiatives such as **BioLedger** and **GeneTrust** demonstrate how blockchain can enhance accountability in genetic data use. However, scalability and global standardization remain major challenges.

7.3 Cloud Sovereignty and Data Localization

To counter data colonialism, several countries are exploring **data localization laws** that require genetic data to be stored on domestic servers. While this enhances sovereignty, it may hinder international scientific collaboration if not balanced with ethical data-sharing protocols.

8. International Policy Responses

8.1 WIPO and the Intergovernmental Committee (IGC)

The **World Intellectual Property Organization's (WIPO)** Intergovernmental Committee on Intellectual Property and Genetic Resources has been deliberating on a **binding international instrument** to protect genetic resources and traditional knowledge. However, progress has been slow due to divergent interests between developed and developing nations. Developing countries advocate for **mandatory disclosure of origin**, while developed nations prefer voluntary guidelines.

8.2 The Global Digital Sequence Information (DSI) Debate

The **CBD COP-15 (2022)** addressed DSI as a critical emerging issue, recognizing its impact on ABS frameworks. While consensus on defining DSI remains elusive, there is growing agreement on integrating **multilateral benefit-sharing mechanisms** to ensure equitable access and use of digital genetic data.

8.3 OECD and UNESCO Recommendations

The **Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)** promotes **open access genomic databases** under ethical governance principles. Meanwhile, **UNESCO's Bioethics Committee** has called for global guidelines ensuring transparency, consent, and community participation in digital genomics.

9. Theoretical Perspectives: Rethinking Ownership and Commons

9.1 The Tragedy of the Genetic Commons

Garrett Hardin's "tragedy of the commons" is often invoked in discussions of biodiversity governance. However, in digital biopiracy, the tragedy arises not from overuse but from **unjust privatization**—where shared knowledge becomes enclosed within corporate patents.

9.2 Cognitive Justice and Decolonization

Scholars like Vandana Shiva and Boaventura de Sousa Santos advocate for **cognitive justice**, emphasizing recognition of diverse epistemologies. Digital biopiracy perpetuates epistemic colonization by privileging Western scientific frameworks over indigenous systems of knowing.

9.3 The Ethics of the Digital Biosphere

The global digital biosphere—comprising genetic, ecological, and cultural data—demands a paradigm of **bioethical pluralism**, where both scientific progress and cultural dignity coexist. Ethical governance should integrate ecological sustainability, cultural rights, and human dignity as coequal principles.

10. Toward a Framework for Ethical Digital Governance

10.1 Redefining "Genetic Resources"

International law must expand the definition of genetic resources to explicitly include **digital sequence information**. This would close the legal loophole that allows corporations to exploit genetic data without triggering ABS obligations.

10.2 Global Benefit-Sharing Mechanisms

A multilateral benefit-sharing fund—similar to the **International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRFA)** model—can ensure equitable redistribution of profits from genetic data commercialization.

10.3 Strengthening Digital Provenance Systems

Blockchain and AI-based traceability tools should be standardized under international governance, enabling transparent tracking of data flows, consent records, and benefit-sharing compliance.

10.4 Ethical AI and Data Stewardship

Developing ethical AI frameworks that mandate **data provenance audits** and **bias mitigation** in genomic analysis is essential to prevent algorithmic exploitation.

10.5 Integrating Community Rights

Indigenous and local communities must be treated as **co-stewards** of genetic resources. Legal recognition of **collective intellectual property rights** can ensure that traditional knowledge holders are legitimate beneficiaries in digital transactions.

11. Conclusion

Digital biopiracy marks a paradigm shift in the discourse of intellectual property and biodiversity governance. The dematerialization of genetic resources challenges traditional legal constructs that depend on tangible ownership and territorial jurisdiction. While international agreements like TRIPS, CBD, and the Nagoya Protocol laid the groundwork for biodiversity protection, they are ill-equipped to handle the realities of digital sequence information, synthetic biology, and AI-driven research.

The path forward requires **integrated global governance**—anchored in transparency, ethical responsibility, and equity. Emerging technologies such as blockchain offer opportunities for reform, but they must be embedded within an inclusive ethical and legal framework that respects data sovereignty and indigenous rights.
Ultimately, preventing digital biopiracy is not merely a legal challenge—it is an ethical imperative to ensure that the benefits of life sciences and digital innovation are shared fairly, preserving both biodiversity and human dignity.

References

1. World Trade Organization, *Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS)*, 1995.
2. United Nations, *Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)*, 1992.

3. *Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits*, 2010.

4. WIPO, *Intergovernmental Committee on Intellectual Property and Genetic Resources, Traditional Knowledge and Folklore: Summary Report*, 2023.

5. OECD, *Principles and Guidelines for Access to Research Data from Public Funding*, 2021.

6. UNESCO, *Report of the International Bioethics Committee on Big Data and Health*, 2022.

7. Vandana Shiva, *Biopiracy: The Plunder of Nature and Knowledge*, South End Press, 1997.

8. Graham Dutfield, *Intellectual Property, Biogenetic Resources and Traditional Knowledge*, Earthscan, 2004.

9. Reichman, J. & Rai, A., "Intellectual Property Rights and Genetic Resource Governance in the Digital Age," *Journal of World Intellectual Property*, Vol. 25, No. 4 (2022).

10. Lawson, C., "Digital Sequence Information and Global Genetic Commons," *Environmental Policy and Law*, Vol. 52, No. 1 (2023).

11. BioLedger Project, *Blockchain for Genetic Resource Governance: Pilot Report*, 2021.

12. Posey, D.A., *Cultural and Spiritual Values of Biodiversity*, UNEP, 1999.

13. Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, *COP-15 Decisions on Digital Sequence Information*, 2022.

14. Tvedt, M.W., "Beyond the Material Transfer Agreement: Digital Genetic Resources and Access Regimes," *Nordic Journal of International Law*, Vol. 89 (2020).

15. Benkler, Y., *The Wealth of Networks: How Social Production Transforms Markets and Freedom*, Yale University Press, 2006.