UNICAMILLUS

UniCamillus Global Health Journal

no. 7 | special issue | pages 72 | December 2024

tab edizioni

Editor-in-Chief: Gian Stefano Spoto
Scientific Editors: Alessandro Boccanelli and Laura Elena Pacifici Noja
Registration no.: 103/2021, Ordinary Court of Rome
2 issues per year
ISSN print: 2785-3713
ISBN print: 979-12-5669-062-6
ISSN open access: 2785-4329
ISBN open access: 979-12-5669-063-3
Contributors: Giovanni A. Pedde, Gianni Profita, Arnold Vahrenwald
no. 7 | special issue | December 2024
First edition December 2024

Foreword by Gianni Profita, DOI: 10.36158/97912566906331

Pharmaceutical Patents' Scope of Protection and WTO Waiver Discussion. Balancing the Pharmaceutical Innovation Ecosystem With the Global Right to Health by Arnold Vahrenwald and Giovanni A. Pedde, DOI: 10.36158/97912566906332

tab edizioni

viale Manzoni 24/c
00185 Roma
www.tabedizioni.it

UniCamillus Global Health Journal
UGHJ

no. 7 | special issue | December 2024

Arnold Vahrenwald
and Giovanni A. Pedde

Pharmaceutical Patents' Scope of Protection and WTO Waiver Discussion

Balancing the Pharmaceutical Innovation Ecosystem With the Global Right to Health

Foreword by Gianni Profita

Table of Contents

Foreword

by Gianni Profita*

The relationship between intellectual property rights and public health has long been a focal point of global debate, one that has only intensified with the Covid-19 pandemic. As a legal scholar who has spent decades navigating the complex intersection of pharmaceutical patent law and global health, I have witnessed firsthand how this debate continues to evolve. At its core is a profound tension: the need to incentivize the development of life-saving drugs and technologies, while ensuring that these innovations reach all those who need them, regardless of their economic circumstances.

The article that follows is both timely and necessary. It examines the balance between patent protection – designed to fuel innovation in the pharmaceutical sector – and the urgent need to ensure global access to medicines, especially in low- and middle-income countries. In doing so, it delves into the very heart of current legal and ethical discussions surrounding the World Trade Organization's TRIPS Agreement and the ongoing TRIPS waiver debates in the context of Covid-19. The global health crisis has underscored the inadequacies of our current IP frameworks in responding to public health emergencies, while also highlighting the potential of legal mechanisms like compulsory licensing and humanitarian licensing to bridge these gaps.

This article provides a thorough analysis of the historical, legal, and ethical dimensions of pharmaceutical patent protection. By presenting key case studies – such as the HIV/AIDS treatment access fight and the Covid-19 vaccine distribution inequalities – it offers readers a comprehensive understanding of the practical impacts of intellectual property law on global health. Furthermore, the policy recommendations outlined here offer a clear, actionable path forward for ensuring that innovation and equitable access to essential medicines are not mutually exclusive but mutually reinforcing.

In an increasingly interconnected world, where health crises transcend borders and economic divisions, it is vital that we rethink how legal frameworks can be adapted to

* Gianni Profita, Rector Magnificus, St. Camillus International University of Health.

meet the needs of all humanity. This article provides invaluable insights into the future of intellectual property law and its role in global health, urging governments, legal practitioners, pharmaceutical companies, and civil society to collaborate in creating a more just and responsive system. It is a must-read for anyone invested in the future of global health and the protection of human rights through innovative legal reform.

Abstract

This article examines the intricate balance between pharmaceutical patent protection and the global right to health, focusing on the role of the WTO's (World Trade Organization) TRIPS (Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights) Agreement and the ongoing discussions around the proposed TRIPS waiver for Covid-19 vaccines and treatments. Pharmaceutical patents are crucial for incentivizing innovation, allowing companies to recover the high costs of research and development. However, these protections can also limit access to life-saving medicines, particularly in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs), where the high cost of patented drugs is often unaffordable.

The article explores this tension through key case studies, including the HIV/AIDS crisis, the Covid-19 pandemic, and the biologic drug market, highlighting both the successes and limitations of existing IP frameworks like compulsory licensing and voluntary licensing agreements. It further delves into the ethical responsibilities of pharmaceutical companies, the role of governments and international organizations in ensuring access to medicines, and the importance of public-private partnerships and incentive-based innovation.

To address these challenges, the article proposes several reforms to the global IP system, including the introduction of an emergency waiver mechanism for pandemics, expansion of compulsory licensing frameworks, and promotion of humanitarian licensing and patent pooling. By embracing more flexible and collaborative approaches, the global community can better balance the need for pharmaceutical innovation with the right to health, ensuring that essential medicines are accessible to all, regardless of economic status.

This article contributes to the ongoing debate about how best to reconcile intellectual property protection with public health priorities, offering policy recommendations for a more equitable global health system.

Introduction

Context and Background

The pharmaceutical industry is one of the most research-intensive sectors in the global economy, investing billions of dollars annually in the development of new treatments and therapies that improve public health and extend human life. Central to this process is the system of intellectual property (IP) rights, particularly patents, which provide exclusive rights to inventors for a limited period, allowing them to recoup research and development (R&D) costs. Patents are crucial in incentivizing innovation, as they offer pharmaceutical companies a temporary monopoly, enabling them to price drugs at levels that reflect the significant investment required to bring new products to market. However, this system also creates a tension between protecting the interests of innovators and ensuring equitable access to life-saving medicines, particularly in LMICs.

The TRIPS Agreement, adopted by the WTO in 1995, established global minimum standards for IP protection, including pharmaceutical patents. Under TRIPS, member states are required to provide patent protection for new pharmaceutical products for at least 20 years, which has sparked widespread debate about the balance between innovation and public health. While patents are essential for fostering pharmaceutical innovation, they can also lead to high drug prices, restricting access to essential medicines in many parts of the world. The global Covid-19 pandemic reignited these concerns, leading to calls for a temporary waiver of certain TRIPS provisions to facilitate the production and distribution of vaccines and treatments, particularly in developing countries.

Research Question

At the heart of this article is the question of how to balance the protection of pharmaceutical patents with the global right to health, especially in times of public health emergencies. Can the patent system, designed to incentivize innovation, coexist with the moral and legal obligation to provide access to life-saving medicines for all? Furthermore, the debate surrounding the WTO TRIPS waiver proposal for Covid-19 vaccines highlights the ongoing struggle to reconcile the need for IP protection with global health imperatives. This article aims to explore whether a more flexible and responsive framework is needed to address the challenges posed by pandemics and other global

health crises, while still fostering innovation in the pharmaceutical industry.

Scope and Purpose

This article will examine the role of pharmaceutical patents in the innovation ecosystem and the impact of IP protection on access to medicines. It will explore how the WTO TRIPS Agreement and its related flexibilities have been utilized in past public health emergencies, such as the HIV/AIDS crisis, and assess the implications of the proposed TRIPS waiver for Covid-19 vaccines. By analyzing key case studies and legal frameworks, this article will explore whether the current IP system adequately balances innovation with public health needs, and whether alternative models, such as compulsory licensing or patent pooling, could better address global health challenges.

Ultimately, this article seeks to answer the following critical questions:

- How can the patent system be structured to support both innovation and global health equity?
- What lessons can be learned from previous public health crises in balancing patent protection with access to medicines?
- Is the WTO TRIPS waiver proposal a viable solution for addressing inequities in vaccine distribution, or does it risk undermining the pharmaceutical innovation ecosystem?

Structure of the Article

This article is organized into seven chapters, each addressing a different facet of the relationship between pharmaceutical patent protection and global access to health. Chapter 1 explores the pharmaceutical innovation ecosystem and the critical role of patents in promoting research and development. Chapter 2 examines the global right to health and the barriers posed by patents to accessing essential medicines, particularly in LMICs. Chapter 3 delves into the WTO TRIPS Agreement and the ongoing waiver discussions, analyzing the key arguments for and against the waiver.

Chapter 4 presents detailed case studies, including the role of compulsory licensing during the HIV/AIDS crisis and the implications of the TRIPS waiver for Covid-19 vaccines. Chapter 5 engages with the ethical and legal perspectives on balancing innovation with health rights, discussing alternative models for pharmaceutical IP protection. Chapter 6 covers issues of translational medicine, its complex research structures and IP rights. Finally, Chapter 7 proposes potential solutions and policy recommendations for creating a more balanced system that fosters innovation while ensuring global access to essential medicines.

Through this comprehensive analysis, the article will contribute to the ongoing debate on how best to balance the pharmaceutical innovation ecosystem with the global right to health, offering insights into the future of intellectual property in the face of emerging global health challenges.

Chapter 1

The Pharmaceutical Innovation Ecosystem and Patent Protection

1.1. The Role of Patents in the Pharmaceutical Industry

Pharmaceutical patents are a cornerstone of the innovation ecosystem, providing essential incentives for companies to invest in the costly and time-consuming process of drug development. The average pharmaceutical product takes over a decade and an estimated $2.6 billion to bring to market, from initial discovery to regulatory approval. Without the protection of patents, it would be difficult for companies to recover these investments, as competitors could easily produce and sell generic versions of a newly developed drug at a fraction of the cost.

Patents grant a temporary monopoly, usually lasting 20 years from the filing date, during which the patent holder has the exclusive right to produce, market, and sell the drug. This exclusivity allows the company to set prices that reflect both the R&D expenses and the risk of failure (given that most drug candidates do not make it through clinical trials). The resulting profits fund future innovation and compensate for the high attrition rate in pharmaceutical research.

The patent system, while essential to pharmaceutical companies, is not without its critics. Critics argue that patents can lead to inflated drug prices, making essential medicines inaccessible to many, particularly in LMICs. High drug prices, such as those seen with HIV/AIDS treatments in the 1990s or more recently with cancer therapies and biologic drugs, underscore the tension between protecting innovation and ensuring public health.

1.2. Copyright vs. Patents: Understanding Intellectual Property Rights in Pharma

While both copyright and patents are forms of intellectual property (IP) protection, they serve distinct purposes, especially in the pharmaceutical industry. Copyright primarily protects creative works, such as books, films, and software, by granting the creator exclusive rights to reproduce, distribute, and display the work. In contrast, patents protect inventions, including new drugs, manufacturing processes, and medical devices.

For pharmaceutical companies, patents are far more critical than copyrights. A new drug is typically the result of years of experimentation, testing, and development, making patent protection crucial for recouping the costs of innovation. Patents cover the com-

position of a drug, its method of use, and the manufacturing process. In some cases, secondary patents can be filed to extend market exclusivity, for example, by patenting a new formulation or delivery method for an existing drug.

The differences between patents and copyrights reflect the nature of pharmaceutical innovation, which is more about scientific discovery and less about creative expression. While copyrights may apply to clinical study reports, research publications, or marketing materials, patents protect the core innovation in drug development, safeguarding the molecule or treatment that holds therapeutic value.

1.3. The Role of Pharmaceutical Companies

The pharmaceutical industry is a highly complex and competitive environment, dominated by two major types of companies: large multinational corporations, often referred to as "Big Pharma," and smaller biotechnology firms. Both rely heavily on patents to survive and thrive, although their approaches to innovation and IP protection can differ significantly.

- Big Pharma and Patent Strategies: Large pharmaceutical companies typically maintain vast patent portfolios to protect their discoveries and control market share. They invest heavily in R&D, with revenues often exceeding billions of dollars annually, and rely on patent protection to generate returns on this investment. Companies like Pfizer, Merck, and Johnson & Johnson are prime examples of Big Pharma firms that utilize patent protection to safeguard blockbuster drugs.
  – Products that generate annual sales of more than $1 billion. Big Pharma often uses patent thickets, which involve filing numerous patents around a single drug, to extend market exclusivity and block generic competition.
- Biotech Startups and Venture Capital: Smaller biotechnology companies also depend on patents, but for different reasons. For many startups, patents are essential for attracting venture capital funding. These companies often focus on early-stage research, such as developing novel drug targets or delivery systems, and then rely on partnerships or acquisitions by larger firms to bring their products to market. Without strong patent protection, biotech startups would struggle to secure the investment needed to develop new therapies, as potential investors would be concerned about the risk of imitation by competitors.

Both types of companies are critical to the pharmaceutical innovation ecosystem. Big Pharma has the resources to take drugs through the lengthy and costly regulatory approval process, while biotech firms often lead the way in early-stage research and development. Together, they form a symbiotic relationship that drives pharmaceutical innovation.

1.4. The Drug Development Process and Patent Timelines

The drug development process is notoriously lengthy, with several key stages that contribute to the overall cost and time required to bring a new drug to market. These stages include:

1. Discovery and Preclinical Research: Researchers identify potential drug targets

(such as proteins or genes involved in a disease) and conduct laboratory tests to evaluate their effects. This phase can take several years and is often the most uncertain, as many drug candidates fail to show promise in early testing.

2. Clinical Trials (Phases I-III): Once a drug shows potential in preclinical research, it enters clinical trials, which involve testing the drug on humans. Clinical trials are divided into three phases:
   - Phase I: Tests the drug's safety in a small group of healthy volunteers.
   - Phase II: Evaluates the drug's efficacy in a larger group of patients with the target condition.
   - Phase III: Conducts large-scale testing to confirm efficacy and monitor for side effects.

   Each phase can last several years, and drugs may fail at any point.
3. Regulatory Review and Approval: After successful clinical trials, the drug is submitted to regulatory bodies (such as the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) or the European Medicines Agency (EMA)) for approval. This process can take additional years as regulators review the data for safety, efficacy, and manufacturing quality.
4. Post-Approval and Marketing: Once approved, the drug enters the market, where it is typically protected by patents for the remainder of the 20-year period. However, due to the length of the development process, the patent clock starts ticking long before the drug reaches the market, leaving most drugs with only 7-12 years of effective market exclusivity.

During the post-approval period, companies often engage in marketing and may pursue secondary patents on different formulations, combinations, or uses of the drug to extend the period of exclusivity beyond the original patent's expiration.

1.5. Patents as a Double-Edged Sword: Encouraging Innovation vs. Limiting Access

While patents are essential to incentivizing pharmaceutical innovation, they also create challenges in terms of global access to medicines. Patent-protected drugs are often priced out of reach for many in developing countries, where public health systems are underfunded and patients lack the ability to pay high prices for treatments. This disparity became particularly apparent during the HIV/AIDS crisis of the late 20th century when antiretroviral drugs were available in high-income countries but inaccessible to millions of patients in LMICs.

To address this issue, international agreements, such as the Doha Declaration on the TRIPS Agreement and Public Health (2001), have sought to provide some flexibility in patent enforcement, allowing countries to issue compulsory licenses in cases of public health emergencies. A compulsory license permits a government to authorize the production of a patented drug without the consent of the patent holder, usually in exchange for a fee. This mechanism has been used successfully to expand access to life-saving treatments in certain circumstances, but its application remains contentious, with many developed countries and pharmaceutical companies viewing it as an infringement on IP rights.

Moreover, the Covid-19 pandemic has brought renewed attention to the lim-

itations of the patent system, particularly in terms of vaccine access. While patent protection incentivized the rapid development of Covid-19 vaccines, it has also raised concerns about unequal distribution, with high-income countries securing the bulk of early vaccine supplies, leaving many LMICs behind.

Italy before 1978 – Without Patents for Pharmaceutical Inventions

In Italy patent protection for pharmaceutical products became available only in 1978. At that time the Constitutional Court (20/03/1978 no. 20) pronounced the unconstitutionality of art. 14 of the R.D. 29/06/1939, no. 1127 (the law on industrial inventions) which prohibited the granting of patents to pharmaceutical inventions, on the ground of some "moral" justifications. The Supreme Court ruled in favor of eighteen pharmaceutical companies, all foreign, requesting the enforcement of foreign patents on medical products in Italy. But surprisingly in spite of this complete lack of any patent protection, Italy had developed a strong pharmaceutical industry: by the end of the 1970s it was the fifth world producer of pharmaceuticals and the seventh exporter [1].

Spending on pharmaceutical R&D in Italy rose from 123 billion lire in 1978 to 1,632 billion lire in 1992, rising from 7.78% of turnover to 11.99% [2]. New pharmaceutical products of Italian origin marketed between 1975 and 1989 made up 9.2% of the world total of 775, while those defined as "of substantial therapeutic innovation" increased from 1.25% of the world total in 1975-79 to 2.78% during 1980-84 and to 3.9% during the period 1985-89.

But strong evidence that concentration and patent protection go hand in hand comes from the Italian experience before and after the 1978 watershed. Before 1978 the Italian pharmaceutical industry was characterized by the presence of a large number of small and medium sized independent firms. After 1978, industry concentration proceeded rapidly: the total number of independent firms went from 464 in 1976 to 390 in 1980 and 335 in 1985. During the same period, no concentration of the productive activity took place in the pharmaceutical industry of the other large western countries. The Italian pharmaceutical industry, in the meanwhile, has lost market share at a constant pace both nationally and worldwide [3]. A conclusion may be drawn: patents in the health industry are likely to favour larger industrial structures. Concerning smaller markets than in the US it is much discussed whether the economic impact of patents in the life sciences and their role in stimulating innovation and attracting investment from the industry in medical R&D are susceptible to cause positive effects or not [4].

Notes and References

1. Boldrin M., Levine D.K. (2008), *Against Intellectual Monopoly*, Cambridge University Press, New York, second edition, DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511510854.

2. The Pharma Letter (1994), *Effects of Pharma Patents in Italy*, May 15.

3. Boldrin M., Levine D.K. (2008), *Against Intellectual Monopoly*, *op. cit.*, chapter 9.

4. Gold E.R., Kaplan W., Orbinski J., Harland-Logan S., N-Marandi S. (2010), *Are Patents Impeding Medical Care and Innovation?*, «PLoS medicine», 7(1), e1000208, DOI: https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1000208.