

© **Geoff Burton** Senior Fellow, United Nations University Institute of Advanced Studies. 19.03.2010

- This presentation will outline:
 - The dysfunctional relationship between CBD, WIPO & WTO
 - Its consequences
 - Suggest a way forward, and
 - describe the basis for concrete action within the WIPO IGC

Why disclosure?

- Patents are a proxy for the commercialisation of genetic resources
- Patents track commercialisation

Disclosure:

- Tracks lawful use
- Evidence of legal certainty
- Supports commercialisation of patents

Why disclosure?

- creates comparative advantage for lawful user
- creates disincentive to commercialise unlawful use
- informs research and investment market about GR sources for commercialisation

Why no progress?

- After more than a decade of effort
- Issue is prominent at CBD, WIPO, WTO-Doha development agenda & TRIPS Council
- Mountain of technical and written submissions have been produced

Authority to act:

WSSD: Para 44 of the Plan of Implementation

UNGA Resolution 57/253

Still no progress – why?

Conventional explanations:

- 1. CBD an Env treaty has no competence to address IP matters
 - The 3rd obj is a trade and economic matter
- -2. Wrong to use IP syst for non-IP uses
 - Long history of multiple public policy uses

Explanation:

The CBD, WIPO, WTO/TRIPS unable to deliver because they are in tension:

- Triangular relationship created and based on absence of progress in each of the other two.
- This is disfunctional

Defusing Disclosure in Patent Applications: Dance of the imperitives

CBD Must act WIPO &TRIPS don't **TRIPS WIPO** Must act Must act CBD &TRIPS don't CBD & WIPO don't

Consequences:

- Stasis for 8 years
- Perception of subservience to other issues under neg
 - Eg GIs, Market access, delay for domestic issues, Co-operation in Trade negotiations

Consequences:

- Builds distrust
- Leads to positional bargaining
- Encourages unrealistic demands
- Frightens stakeholders
- Leads to more rigidity
- Rejection of reasonable proposals eg Swiss, PCT/ PLT proposal

Sleeping Issue: Spread of disclosure in national patent law:

- Includes:
 - Some EU and broader European countries
 - India
 - Brazil
 - China and
 - -more in the pipeline



Factors to consider:

- Any disclosure in one market, is global disclosure
- The more valuable the invention the more likely it is to be patented in a disclosing jurisdiction
- Process of creating international customary law

Breaking the dynamic:

- Action by one institution breaks the tension between all three
- CBD best to start disclosure obligation as part of MAT
- THIS DOES NOT ALTER IP SYSTEM
- Precedent :US Bayh Dole Act 1980 requires disclosure in patent applications of federal funding support

Breaking the dynamic:

 Legal opinion: this action is not inconsistent with international legal obligations

Consequences:

- Removes pressure to re-open TRIPS,
- Encourages IGC discussion focus on practical and effective mutually supportive measures
- Encourages IGC analysis of impact of national action and harmonising disclosure arrangements for the future

Finally:

- action within the CBD reinforces national sovereignty when framed to be undertaken as part of the application of MAT.
- Starting point text is already on the table this week:

Modified Montreal Annex Text:

...Option 1

(Users of genetic resources must disclose in) patent applications whose subject matter is directly based on GR and/or associated TK the country providing GR in accordance with the Convention or source of such resources and/or associated TK as well as information on prior informed consent and evidence that provisions regarding prior informed consent, mutually agreed terms and benefit-sharing have been complied with, in accordance with the national legislation regulations and/or requirements of the country providing the resources in 18 accordance with the Convention.

All Problems have solutions

Thank You.