JLPH: Journal of Law, Politic and Humanities
E-ISSN: 2962-2816
P-ISSN: 2747-1985
https://dinastires.org/JLPH dinasti.info@gmail.com +62 811 7404 455
DOI: https://doi.org/10.38035/jlph.v5i2

Harmonization of International Patient Law in Biotechnology: Strategies For Enhancing Innovation And Global Access

Raymond R. Tjandrawinata[1], Henry Soelistyo Budi[2].
[1]Center for Pharmaceutical and Nutraceutical Research and Policy, Atma Jaya Catholic University of Indonesia, Jakarta, Indonesia.
[2]Faculty of Law, Pelita Harapan University, Tangerang, Indonesia.

Corresponding Author: raytjan@yahoo.com

Abstract: The fragmented global patent landscape poses significant challenges for biotechnology, one of the most innovative sectors of the 21st century. Despite the potential to revolutionize healthcare and agriculture, differences in patent regulation between jurisdictions impede progress, limit equitable access to therapies, and complicate international collaboration. This paper examines the key regulatory frameworks in the United States, the European Union, Japan, and China, focusing on the inherent strengths and challenges of each, by analyzing case studies, such as CRISPR gene editing and CAR-T therapy. The article identifies strategies to deal with ethical dilemmas, intellectual property rights differences, and cross-border enforcement issues. The analysis in this publication encourages harmonization initiatives through regional agreements, international dialogue, and open innovation models to promote global access and sustainable innovation.

Keyword: International Patent Harmonization, Biotechnology Innovation, Global Access to Biotechnological Advances.

INTRODUCTION

Biotechnology is a driving force in modern science, driving advances that address critical global challenges. CRISPR-Cas9 dubbed the “genetic scalpel,” has redefined the possibilities in gene editing, offering cures for genetic disorders previously considered incurable. Similarly, CAR-T cell therapy promises breakthroughs in cancer treatment, while induced pluripotent stem cells (iPSCs) open new horizons in regenerative medicine. However, behind this transformational potential lies a fragmented patent law landscape. Globalization reinforces the urgency for a harmonized intellectual property (IP) framework. Innovators are forced to navigate diverse regulatory systems to secure patents, often facing overlapping costs, long lead times, and conflicting criteria. These inconsistencies disproportionately affect developing economies, limiting their participation in biotechnology innovation and restricting access to life-saving therapies. At the heart of the issue is a delicate balance: encouraging innovation while ensuring equitable access. This article aims to evaluate the patent systems in various key

jurisdictions by highlighting their impact on global innovation and access. In this process, this article seeks to identify the ethical and regulatory challenges associated with patenting biotechnological innovations, which often give rise to debates at the global level. Moreover, this article also proposes concrete steps that can be taken to achieve international harmonization of patent law. While acknowledging that this endeavor is highly complex and challenging, the article emphasizes the importance of a collaborative approach in bridging regulatory gaps as well as supporting public health at the global level.

METHOD

Research Design

This research utilizes a comparative legal analysis approach to examine the patent system in four major jurisdictions: the United States, the European Union, Japan, and China. This method was chosen as each jurisdiction has a different approach to patent regulation, thus providing diverse insights into the impact of regulation on biotechnology innovation and access. In its analysis, this research combines two main methodologies, namely normative and descriptive. The normative approach is used to understand the legal principles and theories underlying the patent system in each jurisdiction, while the descriptive approach is used to describe the practices, challenges, and tangible outcomes of implementing the patent system. The main focus of this research covers three aspects: patent eligibility criteria, enforcement mechanisms and cross-border challenges, and ethical considerations inherent in biotechnology patents.

The data in this study was sourced from various academic literature and relevant policy documents. Key sources include peer-reviewed journals, such as Nature Biotechnology and Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice, which provide in-depth analysis of recent trends and developments in biotechnology patent law. In addition, reports from international organizations, such as the World Intellectual Property Organization and the World Trade Organization (WTO), provide an important global perspective regarding patent law harmonization. Case studies regarding CRISPR technology and CAR-T therapies are also utilized to illustrate the complexity of challenges faced in biotechnology patents. Policy documents, such as the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS Agreement), provide additional frames of reference that enrich this analysis.

The analysis in this study builds on three core interrelated themes. The first theme is the differences in legal frameworks and patent enforcement mechanisms across different jurisdictions. These differences often create challenges in international collaboration and global access to biotechnology innovations. The second theme covers ethical dilemmas that arise in biotechnology patenting, such as the issue of morality in patenting biological materials and its impact on equitable access. The third theme is the identification of potential pathways for international patent law harmonization. This approach includes regulatory strategies, open innovation models, and multilateral dialog to reduce fragmentation in the global patent system. With this framework, the research aims to provide comprehensive solutions to the challenges faced in this area.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Jurisdictional Patent Framework: Strengths and Limitations

Biotechnology patents are one of the unique subsets in the realm of intellectual property rights due to their existence at the intersection of scientific innovation, ethical considerations, and a complex regulatory framework. This unique nature reflects the dynamic interplay between the need to encourage technological innovation and the obligation to protect the public interest through ethical and fair regulation (Jones, T., Smith, R., & Andrews, 2020). Each jurisdiction has different philosophical and legal approaches, creating opportunities for innovation at the national level, but often posing challenges when applied in the context of global collaboration.

United States: Innovation-oriented Yet Controversial

The United States continues to be a global leader in biotechnology patents, thanks to a legal framework designed to encourage innovation. Under Section 101 of the U.S. Patent Act, inventions are broadly defined, allowing for the protection of a wide array of biotechnology innovations, ranging from genetically modified organisms to synthetic genes and biological processes. This allows innovators to apply for patents on revolutionary technologies that have a significant impact on various fields, including health and agriculture (Jones, T., Smith, R., & Andrews, 2020).

One of the landmark rulings that shaped this legal landscape was Association for Molecular Pathology v. Myriad Genetics, Inc. (2013), which clearly ruled that natural DNA sequences are not patentable, although synthetic DNA sequences remain eligible for protection. This ruling balances the need to encourage innovation by preventing the over-exclusivity of naturally occurring biological resources, which are considered the common property of humanity (Consultants, 2024). This legal framework has resulted in rapid advances in biotechnology research and commercialization. One prominent example is CRISPR-Cas9, a revolutionary gene editing technology patented by the Broad Institute and UC Berkeley. While this patent has driven innovation in the fields of genetic therapy and agriculture, the legal dispute between the two institutions reflects challenges in the US patent system. The previous "first-to-invent" based system often led to conflicts in determining patent ownership, despite the switch to a "first-to-file" system in 2011 through the America Invents Act (Rachinsky, T., Sullivan, C., Ghosh, S., Resnick, D.S., Burton, C., Armstrong, MA, Hanish, J.P. Sklan, 2014). However, the flexibility and permissive nature of the patent system in the US also invites criticism. One of the main issues is the potential for monopolistic practices arising from the concentration of patent ownership in a small number of entities. These practices often contribute to the high cost of innovative therapies, limiting public access to life-saving technologies. For example, the price of CAR-T-based therapies in the US can reach hundreds of thousands of dollars per patient, which is considered unaffordable for most of the global community (Lyman, Gary H., 2020).

Moreover, patent monopolies often slow down further innovation as other parties do not have access to develop the patented technology. This creates significant ethical challenges, especially when the technology involves basic needs such as treatments for rare diseases or global pandemics. These concerns have prompted discussions on the need for reforms to improve the balance between rewarding innovators and the accessibility of technology to the wider public. Despite criticism, the US approach to biotechnology patents remains a key model for many other countries. Initiatives such as the Bayh-Dole Act of 1980, which allows universities and research institutes to patent the results of government-funded research, have resulted in a vibrant innovation ecosystem. This policy encourages collaboration between the public and private sectors, accelerating the application of research results into commercial products that benefit society. However, the challenge of creating a more inclusive and equitable system remains an important agenda in the global discussion on biotechnology patent harmonization.

European Union: Balancing Innovation and Ethics

The European Union (EU) has a different approach to patenting biotechnology than other jurisdictions, focusing on the balance between innovation and ethics. The main legal frameworks in the EU, namely the European Patent Convention (EPC) and the Biotechnology Directive (98/44/EC), provide comprehensive guidelines for biotechnology patents. Article 53(a) of the EPC prohibits the patenting of inventions deemed contrary to public morality or public order, such as human cloning or the use of human embryos for commercial purposes

(European Patent Office, 2020). This approach reflects European society's sensitivity to the ethical issues associated with biotechnology. For example, in 2018, the European Court of Justice ruled that crops genetically modified using CRISPR technology should be subject to the genetically modified organism (GMO) regulation, effectively limiting the patenting of such crops (Callaway, 2018). This decision is based on ethical and environmental concerns, especially regarding the potential impact of these technologies on biodiversity and ecosystems. While this approach protects ethical integrity, it often slows down the patenting and commercialization process. Researchers and innovators often face legal uncertainty that discourages further investment and development. Moreover, differences in regulatory interpretations among EU member states add to the challenges, creating fragmentation that hampers the operation of cross-border companies. However, this ethical framework provides a clear direction for socially responsible innovation. By setting ethical boundaries, the EU ensures that the development of biotechnology remains aligned with the values of its society, even if compromises to the speed of innovation are one of the consequences (European Patent Office, 2020). This approach provides an example of how careful regulation can encourage innovation that is not only market-oriented but also ethically responsible.

Japan: Proactive in Regenerative Medicine

Japan has established itself as a global leader in the field of regenerative medicine, particularly through a strategic focus on induced pluripotent stem cell (iPSC) technology. Following the revolutionary discovery by Shinya Yamanaka in 2006, who successfully induced somatic cells into iPSCs, the Japanese government immediately implemented policies to facilitate the patenting and commercialization of iPSC-based therapies (Ilic, 2016). The Japan Patent Office (JPO) is known for its strict examination standards, ensuring only high-quality patents are granted, aiming to maintain the integrity and quality of patented innovations (Japan Patent Office). However, these high standards can be a double-edged sword. Foreign applicants often face challenges in navigating the complex application process in Japan, which can hinder international collaboration and slow down the entry of foreign innovations into the Japanese market (Oda, 2021). Nonetheless, Japan's emphasis on regenerative medicine has set a global benchmark for innovation-oriented patent policies, encouraging other countries to adopt similar approaches to supporting research and development in this field (Azuma, 2015).

China: Rapid Expansion but Lax Enforcement

In the past few decades, China has undergone a significant transformation in the biotechnology patent landscape. Backed by government initiatives aimed at making China a global leader in science and technology, the country is now surpassing other countries in biotechnology patent filings. According to data from the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), China has surpassed the United States in annual biotechnology patent filings. In 2022, China filed 70,015 PCT applications, while the United States filed 59,056 applications (WIPO, 2023). Although specific data for biotechnology patents is not mentioned, this trend shows China's dominance in international patent filings in various technological fields, including biotechnology. However, this rapid growth is not free from criticism. China's patent system is often criticized for its weak enforcement mechanism. Although legal reforms have beens made to improve intellectual property (IP) protection, international stakeholders often face challenges in navigating the less-than-transparent regulatory process in China (Huang, 2017). The emphasis on quantity over quality in patent filings raises concerns about the validity and enforceability of many patents in China. Moreover, although the number of patent filings is increasing, the underlying quality and innovation are often questioned. Many patents filed are considered “utility patents” with low innovative value, which may hinder overall technological progress (Prud’homme, 2015). The lack of effective law enforcement also leads to the

proliferation of patent infringement, which undermines the confidence of foreign investors and hinders international collaboration in biotechnology research (Yu & Yip, 2021). To address these challenges, China needs to focus on improving the quality of patents filed and strengthening enforcement mechanisms. Measures such as increased transparency in the application process, training for patent examiners, and stricter enforcement against infringement can help boost the confidence of the international community and encourage more meaningful innovation in the biotechnology sector (Jiang, Li, 2016).

Barriers to Harmonization

International patent law harmonization efforts face a variety of complex obstacles, mainly due to fundamental differences in national legal systems that reflect each country's historical, cultural, and economic priorities. One of the key differences lies in the approach between common law and civil law systems. In common law systems, such as in the United States, judicial interpretation plays a central role. Judges have the flexibility to adapt legal precedents to the context of new technologies, allowing for more dynamic adaptation of the law to evolving innovations. This approach allows the law to evolve through court decisions that are based on a case-by-case basis, leaving room for broader interpretations according to specific situations (Moses, 2003). In contrast, the civil law system practiced in the European Union and many Asian countries relies more on written laws and legal codification. These systems prioritize regulatory consistency and legal certainty, with judges acting as interpreters of the law rather than lawmakers through precedent. This approach may limit flexibility in adapting the law to new technological developments, as changes to the law usually require a longer formal legislative process (Moses, 2003). These fundamental differences create significant challenges in the effort to harmonize international patent law. Countries with a common law tradition may be more open to adaptive judicial interpretation, while countries with a civil law tradition may emphasize the importance of legal certainty through strict codification. Moreover, differences in legal procedures, such as the “first-to-invent” system in the United States before 2013 compared to the “first-to-file” system common in other countries, add to the complexity of harmonizing international patent practices (Macedo, 2013). Therefore, the harmonization of international patent law requires an approach that takes into account these differences in legal systems, by seeking a balance between interpretative flexibility and regulative consistency to effectively support global innovation.

Case Studies in Biotechnology CRISPR-Cas9: Arena of Patent Disputes

The development of CRISPR-Cas9, a revolutionary tool in genetic engineering, has sparked an intense legal debate over patent ownership. The dispute between the Broad Institute and UC Berkeley highlights the complexity of the fragmented patent landscape. The Broad Institute managed to obtain an initial patent in the United States through an expedited application, while UC Berkeley claimed broader global rights based on their basic research (Shaffer, 2022). This case illustrates the inefficiencies and redundancies in the current system. Innovators often face conflicting outcomes across different jurisdictions, which delays commercialization and complicates collaboration. A harmonized framework can mitigate these issues, ensuring that patent rights are allocated in a transparent and fair manner (Ito & Shirai, 2023).

mRNA Vaccines: Collaboration as a Model of Harmonization

The rapid development of mRNA vaccines during the COVID-19 pandemic highlights the potential of collaborative approaches in biotechnology innovation. Companies such as Moderna and BioNTech leveraged open-access data and patent pooling to accelerate vaccine development and distribution. The Medicines Patent Pool (MPP) further facilitates access by licensing patents to generic manufacturers in low-income countries (Kashte et al., 2021). This

model shows how harmonization efforts, based on open innovation, can balance the competing demands of innovation and access. Extending such initiatives to other areas of biotechnology could promote equitable global access while maintaining research incentives (Chesbrough et al., 2024).

Strategic Path towards Harmonization of Biotechnology Patent Laws

Achieving harmonization in biotechnology patent law is a complex challenge that requires a multifaceted approach. Integration of legal reforms, ethical oversight, and socioeconomic interventions are key in this endeavor. Such an approach can be realized through regional collaboration, global dialogue and multilateral agreements, and the adoption of an open innovation model.

Regional Collaboration

Regional frameworks, such as the Unified Patent Court (UPC) in the European Union, offer valuable insights into the simplification of patent enforcement. By centralizing dispute resolution mechanisms, the UPC reduces jurisdictional conflicts and encourages greater consistency in patent adjudication. This approach not only improves the efficiency of legal proceedings but also reduces litigation costs for stakeholders (Ghidini, 2023). Extending similar models to other regions can lay the foundation for global cooperation in the enforcement of intellectual property rights, particularly in the field of biotechnology. However, the implementation of such a model requires customization to the legal and cultural context of each region to ensure effectiveness and wide acceptance.

Global Dialogue and Multilateral Agreements

International organizations such as the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) and the World Trade Organization (WTO) are in a strategic position to facilitate dialogue regarding the harmonization of biotechnology patent law. Multilateral agreements, such as Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS), can be extended to address emerging biotechnology issues. Integrating ethical oversight into these agreements will enhance their legitimacy and social acceptance (Bainbridge, 1997). This approach allows for a balance between the protection of intellectual property rights and the public interest, especially in the context of access to vital health technologies. However, challenges in achieving global consensus and divergent interests between countries are obstacles that need to be overcome through effective diplomacy and negotiation.

Open Innovation Model

Open innovation, exemplified by patent pooling and collaborative licensing agreements, offers pragmatic solutions to traditional patent accessibility challenges. Initiatives such as the Medicines Patent Pool (MPP) have demonstrated feasibility in reducing costs while expanding access to essential health technologies (Kashte et al., 2021). Extending this model to advanced biotechnologies, such as gene editing and regenerative medicine, could address global inequalities in access to medical innovation. This approach encourages collaboration across sectors and countries, enabling a freer flow of knowledge and technology, and accelerating the development of innovative health solutions. However, the success of this model depends on the commitment of stakeholders to openly share knowledge and resources, as well as a regulatory framework that supports open innovation practices. Overall, the harmonization of biotechnology patent law requires a collaborative effort involving various stakeholders at the regional and global levels. An approach that integrates legal reforms, ethical oversight, and open innovation models can create an ecosystem that supports sustainable innovation and equitable access to biotechnology technologies. Thus, challenges in the harmonization of

biotechnology patent law can be addressed, paving the way for scientific advancements that benefit all of humanity.

CONCLUSION

Harmonizing international patent law in biotechnology is a complex task, involving multiple interests, different regulations, and ethical and economic challenges to overcome. However, this endeavor is indispensable for creating a global environment conducive to innovation and equitable access to biotechnology technologies. As biotechnology continues to evolve into one of the key pillars in solving global problems such as food security, treatment of rare diseases, and mitigation of climate change, the need for an integrated patent framework has become more pressing. This harmonization approach should be able to address the challenges of fragmentary regulations across different jurisdictions. For instance, the differences between common law and civil law legal systems create barriers to the harmonization of patent policies, thus collaborative efforts are required to build an agreement that can be universally applied. Moreover, the integration of ethical oversight into international patent regulation should be a priority to ensure that the innovations generated are not only profit-oriented but also respect human values and environmental sustainability. Harmonization of patent law does not only concern legal aspects but also demands support from economic and social models that enable equitable access to technology, especially for developing countries. Initiatives such as the Medicines Patent Pool have shown how open innovation can be an effective middle ground in encouraging collaboration while maintaining incentives for researchers and innovators. By extending a similar approach to other biotechnology technologies, global disparities in technology access can be reduced, allowing more of the world's population to experience the benefits of scientific progress. In addition to practical benefits, the harmonization of patent laws also serves as a symbol of collective human progress. In the face of global challenges such as pandemics, health inequalities, and ecological threats, a system that allows innovation to flourish while ensuring inclusive access reflects the international community's commitment to justice and solidarity. A global agreement on biotechnology patents will not only foster technological development but also lay the foundation for stronger and mutually beneficial relations between nations. Thus, fostering innovation through harmonized patent law is not just about facilitating technological development, but also about building a more sustainable and equitable future. Harmonization of biotechnology patent law should be seen as a long-term investment in advancing science for the common good. In this context, the success of harmonization efforts will largely depend on political will, support from stakeholders, and effective collaboration at all levels. The world needs not only innovation but also a framework that ensures that such innovation can be enjoyed by all humanity without discrimination.

REFERENCE

Azuma, K. (2015). Regulatory landscape of regenerative medicine in Japan. Current Stem Cell Reports 1.

Bainbridge, D. (1997). Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights: A Concise Guide to the TRIPs Agreement. HeinOnline.

Chesbrough, H., Radziwon, A., Vanhaverbeke, W., & West, J. (2024). The Oxford Handbook of Open Innovation. Oxford University Press.

Consultants, T. (2024). Gene Patenting: The Controversial Battle Over Who Owns Your DNA. Https://Ttconsultants.Com/Gene-Patenting-the-Controversial-Battle-over-Who-Owns-Your-Dna/.

Ghidini, G. (2023). The interplay between antitrust law and intellectual property: stages of the European evolution. Journal of Antitrust Enforcement, 11(Supplement_1), i24–i36.

Huang, C. (2017). Recent development of the intellectual property rights system in China and challenges ahead. Management and Organization Review, 13(1), 39–48.

Ilic, D. (2016). iPSC in the past decade: the Japanese dominance. In Regenerative Medicine (Vol. 11, Issue 8, pp. 747–749). Taylor & Francis.

Ito, B., & Shirai, K. (2023). Patent law harmonization and international trade. International Journal of Economic Policy Studies, 17(1), 289–306.

Jiang, Li, and L. J. (2016). Stem Cells, Patents and Regulation in China: Inadequacy. Regulating Human Embryonic Stem Cell in China: A Comparative Study on Human Embryonic Stem Cell's Patentability and Morality in US and EU.

Jones, T., Smith, R., & Andrews, L. (2020). Biotechnology patents and ethical considerations: A global perspective. Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice.

Kashte, S., Gulbake, A., El-Amin III, S. F., & Gupta, A. (2021). COVID-19 vaccines: rapid development, implications, challenges and future prospects. Human Cell, 34(3), 711–733.

Lyman, Gary H., et al. (2020). Economic evaluation of chimeric antigen receptor T-cell therapy by site of care among patients with relapsed or refractory large B-cell lymphoma. AMA Network Open 3.4.

Macedo, C. R. (2013). First-to-file and first-to-invent priority: An American historical perspective. Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice 8.1.

Moses, L. B. (2003). Adapting the law to technological change: A comparison of common law and legislation. University of New South Wales Law Journal,.

Oda, H. (2021). Japanese law. Oxford University Press.

Prud'homme, D. (2015). China's shifting patent landscape and State-led patenting strategy. Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice 10.8.

Rachinsky, T., Sullivan, C., Ghosh, S., Resnick, D.S., Burton, C., Armstrong, MA, Hanish, J.P. Sklan, A. (2014). Pharmaceutical Patent Analyst.

Shaffer, C. (2022). Broad defeats Berkeley CRISPR patent. Nature Biotechnology, 40(4), 445.

Yu, R., & Yip, K. (2021). New Changes, New Possibilities: China's Latest Patent Law Amendments. Oxford University Press.