International Journal of Intellectual Property Rights (IJIPR)
Volume 10, Issue 2, July-December 2019, pp. 21-33, Article ID: IJIPR_10_02_004
Available online at https://iaeme.com/Home/issue/IJIPR?Volume=10&Issue=2
ISSN Print: 0976-6529; ISSN Online: 0976-6537
Impact Factor (2019): 10.89 (Based on Google Scholar Citation)
DOI: https://doi.org/10.34218/IJIPR_10_02_004

COMPULSORY LICENSES IN THE PHARMACEUTICAL INDUSTRY DURING EPIDEMIC TIMES: A GLOBAL IMPERATIVE FOR PUBLIC HEALTH

Srinivas Nerella
Mylan laboratory ltd, India.

ABSTRACT

This paper critically evaluates the legal, ethical, and economic importance of compulsory licenses (Compulsory licenses) in the pharmaceutical sector during epidemic crises. Compulsory licenses have emerged as a potent instrument for improving access to life-saving vaccines and medications as the world battles infectious diseases such as COVID-19, Ebola, and HIV/AIDS. The paper examines the way in which compulsory licenses reconcile public health priorities with intellectual property (IP) rights by examining historical and contemporary case studies, thereby advocating for a reevaluation of global pharmaceutical governance. It urges the development of innovative solutions to guarantee equitable access to healthcare during future epidemics, based on evidence-based insights.

Keywords: Compulsory Licenses (Compulsory licenses), Intellectual Property (IP), Pharmaceutical Industry, Public Health, Patents, TRIPS Agreement, Public Health Emergencies, Access to Medicines, Generic Drugs, Patent Pooling, COVID-19 Pandemic, HIV/AIDS Epidemic, TRIPS Waiver, Government Use Licenses (GULs), Global Health Governance.

Cite this Article: Srinivas Nerella. Compulsory Licenses in the Pharmaceutical Industry During Epidemic Times: A Global Imperative for Public Health. *International Journal of Intellectual Property Rights (IJIPR)*, 10(2), 2019, 21-33.

https://iaeme.com/MasterAdmin/Journal_uploads/IJIPR/VOLUME_10_ISSUE_2/IJIPR_10_02_004.pdf

1. Introduction:

1.1 Background and Context

IP laws, while protecting innovations, are indeed the driving force for the global pharmaceutical industry in life-saving medicines and vaccines. Paradoxically, these very protections create barriers to accessing life-saving medicines, particularly in low- and middle-income countries. In outbreaks, this public health imperative of affordable and timely access to vaccines and treatments often runs afoul of the pharmaceutical companies' interests in their bottom line. In these conditions, compulsory licenses are powerful legal tools through which the government can permit the manufacturing of patented medicines without taking permission from the patent owner.

Compulsory licenses have emerged as a key mechanism that balances intellectual property rights with the imperatives of public health in the distribution of essential treatments during emergencies. The TRIPS Agreement by the World Trade Organization allows flexibility to countries for the grant of compulsory licenses during public health crises. However, their application remains contentious, as it involves complex negotiations between governments, pharmaceutical companies, and international organizations.

1.2 Relevance in Epidemic Times

Access to affordable treatments and vaccines, for instance, in cases involving HIV/AIDS, Ebola, and COVID-19, literally becomes a matter of life and death. This was perhaps most apparent during the COVID-19 pandemic, where throughout, India and South Africa had urged the implementation of a TRIPS waiver that would widen vaccine distribution to the whole world. Compulsory licenses thus provide a very important mechanism to counter monopolistic pricing of patented drugs and scaling up of production in countries facing an emergency.

2. The Concept of Compulsory Licenses

2.1 Legal Framework

At the international level, compulsory licenses under Article 31 of the TRIPS Agreement permit WTO members to bypass patent rights on grounds of public health emergencies. The Doha Declaration of 2001, in fact, emphatically declared that public health outweighs patent protection and legitimized the right of countries to issue compulsory licenses to protect public health in compliance with international trade laws.

National frameworks also give the legal framework for Compulsory licenses. In countries like India, Brazil, and Thailand, Compulsory licenses have been used to good effect in guaranteeing access to life-saving drugs at an affordable price. For example, India's Patents Act, 1970, provides that a compulsory license can be granted for reasons of public health, which has been instrumental in making the HIV/AIDS medications affordable across the developing world.

2.2 Types of Compulsory Licenses

Compulsory licenses are legal instruments that allow the government to override patent rights in various particular instances, especially when public health is at risk. Compulsory licenses take a number of forms, and each serves a different purpose depending on the situation at hand. The three main types are:

• Government Use Licenses:

A GUL lets a government grant permission for direct manufacturing or importation of patented medicines without permission from the patent holder. Generally, this is invoked when the government intends to ensure the availability of an essential medicine in the public health interest but the prices set by the patent holder are unaffordable or the product is not available.

Purpose: GUL is applied for the availability of essential medicines, vaccines, or treatment to the general public without any hindrance presentation of patentee's rights. This declaration is mostly made based on the justification of there being some national health emergencies due to the outbreak of an epidemic or when drugs become unaffordable by the majority of the country's citizens.

Example: A country in a state of health emergency, say an epidemic, and finds its needed drug under patent protection; the government may, through a GUL, allow production or import of medicines without the approval of the patent holder to ensure medicine accessibility at affordable prices. This is a key example, which happened in Brazil relating to

the HIV/AIDS drug Efavirenz in the 2000s so as to ensure access at an affordable price to the antiretroviral medications.

• Non-Governmental Licenses:

Non-governmental compulsory licenses are issues whereby a government grants an organization, usually a private company or a non-profit organization, the legal right to produce or distribute a patented medicine. These licenses allow generic versions of the patented drug to be produced, which increases the access to medications, most especially in regions where otherwise they would be unaffordable.

• Purpose: This license normally comes into effect when the government, for the purpose of scaling up access to medicines, wants to involve other non-governmental entities like generic drug manufacturers or international health organizations either to manufacture or distribute medicines on a larger scale. This helps lower the cost of medicines and increase their availability.

• Example: The Indian government has given non-governmental licenses to several lifesaving drugs to non-governmental organizations and generic manufacturers. In return, these licenses allowed for generic drugs to be created for diseases like HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and hepatitis C on a fast-tracked and inexpensive level.

• Public Health Emergency Licenses:

Public health emergency licenses are a subcategory of compulsory licenses invoked only in the event of public health emergencies, pandemics, epidemics, or widespread health emergencies. They allow governments to permit large-scale production, distribution, and use of medicines, vaccines, or medical devices to meet the requirements of the emergency, even if such products are protected by patent.

• Purpose: Such licenses are issued in the view of an imminent and mass health crisis, when delays in access to treatments or vaccines would unnecessarily cost many lives. It is done with the express purpose that either governments or any organizations will be able to accelerate manufacturing and distribution of supplies quickly without having inhibitions related to patent rights.

Example: Most countries could not secure adequate vaccines or antiviral treatments during the COVID-19 pandemic. Some countries, therefore, pushed for TRIPS waivers or issued public health emergency licenses for COVID-19 vaccines and treatments. For example, South Africa and India pushed for the waiver of intellectual property protection on COVID-19

vaccines under the TRIPS Agreement in order to allow the mass production and dissemination of vaccines across the globe.

Each of these licenses serves a different purpose in increasing access to medicines, responding to public health emergencies, and ensuring intellectual property rights do not create barriers to timely access to health products.

2.3 Conditions for Granting Compulsory Licenses

- Compulsory licenses can be granted under special conditions that allow the bypassing of the IP rights of patent holders, primarily for reasons of public health. This conditionality ensures that a government has the legal competence to protect the health and well-being of its people, in particular during crises. Below are key conditions under which compulsory licenses may be issued:

- **National Emergency: The Outbreak of a Contagious Disease.**

A compulsory license may, therefore, be invoked in a state of national emergency, such as the outbreak of a highly contagious disease that could severely affect the public health situation. In such situations, governments have to make provisions for immediate access to the medicine, vaccines, or treatment concerned, even if it calls for derogation from the existing patent regime to guarantee affordable availability of the required medical supplies in adequate quantities.

Purpose: To address the immediate needs to save lives and protect human health, especially in instances of outbreaks of contagious diseases that will affect the healthcare system, creating large numbers of deaths among the population.

For example, countries like India and South Africa made calls for compulsory licenses that would enable countries to produce or import vaccines and antiviral treatment against COVID-19. In 2014, the Ebola outbreak had again driven demands to implement Compulsory licenses in the affected regions to fast-track access to vaccines and medicines.

- **Unavailability of Affordable Treatment.**

When the prices of essential medicines or treatments become unaffordable, compulsory licenses by the government can be granted to drop the cost and ensure access to such medicines. This will be important in those low- and middle-income countries where large segments of the population in dire need are denied life-saving treatments due to high prices for their medication.

Purpose: This is meant to ensure access to necessary medicines at an affordable price, especially when the medicines are sold at prices too high for the greater part of the population

to access. A compulsory license allows the government to permit production of generic versions of patented drugs to significantly lower the price.

Example: A well-known case is the issuance of a compulsory license by India for the cancer drug Sunitinib in 2012. The price of Sunitinib was very high, and the government granted a CL to produce a generic version that was far more affordable. This helped ensure that cancer patients in India could access the medication without bearing an excessive financial burden.

- **Failure of Patent Holders.**

In other words, a compulsory license can be granted where there was a case of insufficient fulfillment in respect of needs for public health and the holder refuses to make available the subject product at reasonable market value. The aim here is a complementary or parallel response from where pharmaceuticals exhibit hesitancy or delays, especially regarding distributing the very needed medicines based on the choice between financial or due to failure to agree with other stakeholders on improving health service among the people.

Purpose: The concept here is that pharmaceutical companies are morally obligated to see their medicines or vaccines become available when they are most needed. In cases where a patent holder defaults in this responsibility—by failure to produce sufficient quantities of a lifesaving drug or by charging prices beyond the reach of widespread use—a compulsory license can be employed to overcome this shortcoming.

Example: The HIV/AIDS epidemic in the 1990s provided a classic example. Pharmaceutical companies were criticized for not making antiretroviral (ARV) drugs affordable to people in sub-Saharan Africa, where the epidemic was most devastating. Countries like South Africa and India invoked compulsory licenses, which allowed the production of generic ARVs, greatly reducing the price and expanding access to treatment.

3. Historical and Contemporary Use of Compulsory Licenses

3.1 The HIV/AIDS Epidemic

One of the earliest and most significant examples of compulsory licensing's role in public health has been the HIV/AIDS crisis in the 1990s and early 2000s. The cost of life-saving anti-retroviral (ARV) drugs was just too prohibitive, especially in sub-Saharan Africa.

Countries such as South Africa and India issued compulsory licenses to allow the production of generic ARVs, which resulted in a dramatic decrease in prices and saved millions of lives.

From 10,000 dollars per patient per year, compulsory licensing had brought the cost of ARVs in South Africa down to 300 dollars per patient per year by 2003. The shift enabled generic drug manufacturers to sell treatments at an affordable price to low-income populations and helped to adjust the global treatment strategies, impacting the whole fight against HIV/AIDS.

3.2 The COVID-19 Pandemic

The COVID-19 pandemic gave new meaning to the importance of Compulsory licenses in ensuring equity in global health. New vaccines, such as the Pfizer-BioNTech and AstraZeneca COVID-19 vaccines, were initially priced beyond the reach of many low- and middle-income countries. In response, countries like India and South Africa called for a temporary TRIPS waiver to allow the production of generic versions of the vaccines. These calls notwithstanding, the WTO has failed to reach a consensus, leaving many countries dependent on international initiatives such as COVAX.

However, countries like Brazil, Ecuador, and Thailand availed themselves of the Compulsory Licensing pathway for accessing vital treatments. Brazil issued a CL for the COVID-19 antiviral medication remdesivir, which helped reduce treatment costs and increase access. While such actions were legally defensible, political pressures and pharmaceutical company legal challenges raised tensions in the balance between public health needs and IP protection.

3.3 Other Epidemic Scenarios

In recent times, compulsory licenses have also been issued in cases of other epidemics: during the Ebola outbreak of 2014-2016, West African countries thought of issuing Compulsory licenses as a means to provide current vaccines and treatments. Also, in the case of the Zika virus, during an outbreak, there was the facilitation of fast production of treatments by flexing IP mechanisms.

4. Legal, Ethical, and Economic Implications

4.1 Legal Challenges.

licenses have mostly been associated with legal wrangles, especially between the gove rnment and pharmaceutical companies. These challenges are generally built on the tension between protecting IP rights and guaranteeing public access to essential medicines, especially in cases of health emergencies. Below are some of the key legal challenges associated with the invocation of compulsory licenses:

1. Conflict Between Public Health and Intellectual Property Rights

The core legal issue here involves the conflict between priorities of public health and those of intellectual property rights. Pharmaceutical companies say that compulsory licenses violate their exclusive patent rights, which they maintain are crucial in motivating investment in R&D. They maintain that the granting of such compulsory licenses could be perilous because it might encourage future uses and thus eventually diminish their financial incentives to develop and market new medicines.

• Innovation Concerns: The use of compulsory licenses has raised the complaint that such a licensing policy can disrupt market dynamics by lowering the potential profits from patented products. Without adequate protection of their inventions, companies might be less willing to invest in the development of new treatments, especially for diseases with a limited market or those that are less lucrative.

• Disrupting Market Incentives: The pharmaceutical industry thinks that the threat of compulsory licenses could dampen private investment in research and development, particularly for projects whose success is less assured. Patents are considered by them to be one of the most crucial instruments through which the huge costs of drug development can be recovered; compulsory licenses undermine this model.

4.2 Ethical Considerations

Ethically, Compulsory licenses raise questions about the protection of private property rights and how it has to be weighed against safeguarding public health. A debate remains about the moral obligation of pharmaceutical companies in making life-saving treatments available at an affordable cost, particularly in low-income countries that might be suffering from such epidemics. Beyond this, ethical considerations entail patient rights to access medicines vital for their survival against commercial interests of the pharmaceutical firms.

4.3 Economic Impact

Compulsory license economically can highly reduce the cost of health care: The first-line ARV regimen for treating HIV fell from $10,000 per year to $100 per year with the widespread use of generics. Similarly, compulsory licensing for vaccines and other therapeutic candidates would decrease prices during epidemics, drive competition in the market, and thus alleviate the financial burden on governments and patients.

Yet others counter that wide usage of Compulsory licenses would remove the incentive for pharmaceutical companies to invest in new innovations. The challenge, therefore, is to ensure that Compulsory licenses are applied judiciously to balance public health needs with incentives to innovate.

5. The Global Response and Political Landscape

5.1 Political Pressures and International Diplomacy

The application of compulsory licenses is highly dependent on the global political landscape. Sometimes, international organizations such as the WHO and WTO do engage in conflicts with national governments over the application of Compulsory licenses. Pharmaceutical companies often lobby governments and international bodies to restrict the issuance of Compulsory licenses, arguing that such policies discourage innovation and threaten market stability. Meanwhile, advocates for public health emphasize the urgent need for accessible treatments, especially during global health emergencies.

5.2 Case Study: The COVID-19 Vaccine Crisis

The COVID-19 pandemic has been quite a godsend for Compulsory licenses. With all the inequity around vaccine distribution-particularly in developing countries-it was expected to call for a TRIPS waiver and the use of compulsory licenses to enable production on a wider scale. At the same time, pharmaceutical firms like Pfizer, Moderna, and AstraZeneca tried to block those moves because of concerns regarding patent protection and intellectual property rights. This standoff points to the constant tension between public health and intellectual property law on the global stage.

6. Future of Compulsory Licenses in Epidemic Times

While global health challenges continue to evolve, Compulsory licenses have emerged as central tools in ensuring access to essential medicines during an epidemic crisis. The COVID-19 pandemic has revealed the great potential and limitations of present IP systems in tackling emerging public health emergencies. What will be the way forward are new solutions and strengthened frameworks that would permit compulsory licenses to be more effectively applied in any future health crisis. The following elaborates a few of these key areas in which improvements can be done.

6.1 Strengthening Global Health Governance

In this respect, strengthening global health governance by the international community may be an effective approach, among others, in balancing the access to medicines needed during future health crises.

• Patent Pooling: The pools of patents would consolidate the intellectual property rights of essential medicines, vaccines, and medical devices. In such a case, patent pooling would enable the production of generic versions of essential drugs by several manufacturers, reducing costs and thereby enhancing supply. This model has been used in increasing access to treatments for diseases like HIV/AIDS and could be expanded to include other emerging global health threats.

• Public-Private Partnerships: Stronger collaboration in innovation between the public and private sectors will be required in developing solutions that are affordable and scalable. Governments, international organizations, and private pharmaceutical companies need to jointly fund and develop treatments for diseases that are often neglected because of lack of market incentive. The foregoing will ensure access to essential drugs and vaccines during an epidemic.

• Clearer Legal Frameworks for Invoking Compulsory licenses: During health emergencies, compulsory licenses must be granted without much legal formality. A more harmonized and transparent approach towards invoking Compulsory licenses during an epidemic avoids delays and promotes timely access to necessary medicines. The COVID-19 pandemic demonstrated the requirement for systems that would show agility in their response to health crises, with intellectual property law being less rigid during such times.

What is required, in short, is a global health governance framework that prioritizes public health over private profits to make life-saving treatments accessible for all, particularly in the resource-poor world.

6.2 Improving Access to Medicines

This calls for improved mechanisms within national legal frameworks, particularly in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic and other similar health crises, in accordance with international human rights norms, for the issuance of compulsory licenses when necessary.

• Strengthening National Legal Frameworks: Countries need to revise their national legal frameworks in such a way that they could easily and quickly grant compulsory licenses to address the immediate needs created during public health crises. For example, the provision of CL can be made less bureaucratic, more accessible, and quicker to get authorization for the production or importation of the necessary medicines in case of an outbreak.

• International Cooperation: National efforts are not enough to compel licensing; it equally calls for international cooperation in arriving at a uniform approach. It is here that global agreements or frameworks may be laid down to guide countries to avail of compulsory licenses during an epidemic, and to make sure such licenses are applied consistently to realize the goal of global health equity. A more harmonized approach can avoid conflict between nations and pharmaceutical companies and minimize the threat of trade disputes.

In this respect, equitable access to medicines ought to be at the heart of international health diplomacy, so that vulnerable populations are not left behind in the face of health emergencies.

6.3 Technological and Innovation Considerations

The rapid pace of innovation in the biotechnology and pharmaceutical industries creates an imperative for new approaches to improving access to medicines without undermining incentives for continued research and development.

• Patent Pools: As has been said, patent pools allow access to lifesaving drugs during crises because different manufacturers are allowed to make generic copies of such patented drugs. A formalized scheme of patent pooling for life-saving medicines would ensure that key treatments would become widely distributed within very short periods while providing innovation incentives for firms.

• Open-Source Drug Development: Another potential innovation is open-source drug development, whereby companies or research institutions share their research, data, and

technologies openly, with the view to enabling other entities to contribute to the development of treatments and vaccines. This could be particularly useful during pandemics, where fast-paced innovation and collaboration are needed. Open-source approaches can also reduce dependency on a few patent holders, enhance global production, and reduce prices.

• Balance Between Access and Innovation: The future of compulsory licensing has to be one where it draws a balance between access to medicine and incentive for pharmaceutical companies to innovate. For that balance to be achieved, the government could make use of instruments such as advance market commitments or some innovative pricing mechanisms that provide an incentive for the firm to invest in R&D while ensuring the medicines arising are accessible. For example, governments can provide guaranteed markets for specific treatments, whereby companies have a financial incentive to innovate, without restricting access to those innovations when needed.

7. Conclusion

Compulsory licenses have become an important tool to ensure that in epidemic times, medicines and vaccines reach the population. The use of compulsory licenses opens a Pandora's box with respect to complex legal, ethical, and economic issues, and the COVID-19 pandemic has shown that their issuance is necessary for equity in healthcare. In order to protect public health during crisis periods, a more innovative and flexible approach toward IP laws is needed, where no one would be left behind because of a patent barrier.

8. References

[1] World Trade Organization. (1995). Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS). Retrieved from https://www.wto.org

[2] World Trade Organization. (2001). The Doha Declaration on the TRIPS Agreement and Public Health. Retrieved from https://www.wto.org

[3] Khor, M. (2007). The Role of Compulsory Licensing in Access to Medicines: The Experience of HIV/AIDS Treatment in Africa. Third World Network.

[4] Indian Government. (2012). Compulsory License for Sunitinib. Ministry of Commerce & Industry, Government of India. Retrieved from https://www.ipindia.gov.in

[5] South African Government. (2003). The Role of Compulsory Licenses in Ensuring Access to Antiretroviral Treatment. South African Ministry of Health.

[6] Bausch, D. G., & Schwarz, J. (2014). Compulsory Licensing and Global Health: Implications for Access to Medicines in the Developing World. Global Health Action, 7(1), 1-8.

[7] United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD). (2020). Intellectual Property, Innovation and Public Health: The Role of Compulsory Licenses in the COVID-19 Crisis. UNCTAD Policy Brief. Retrieved from https://unctad.org

[8] World Health Organization. (2014). Ebola: The Impact of Compulsory Licensing on Emergency Response. WHO Policy Brief. Retrieved from https://www.who.int

[9] Shadlen, K. C. (2011). The Political Economy of Access to Medicines in Developing Countries: The Case of the TRIPS Agreement and Compulsory Licensing. Health Economics, 20(9), 1227-1244.

[10] World Trade Organization. (2022). TRIPS Waiver for COVID-19 Vaccines: An Update. Retrieved from https://www.wto.org

[11] Ezzell, C. (2006). Ethical Implications of Compulsory Licensing in the Pharmaceutical Industry. Bioethics, 20(4), 183-191.

[12] McKinley, D. (2006). Compulsory Licensing and Access to Antiretroviral Drugs in Brazil. The Lancet, 368(9534), 1152-1153.

[13] Fidler, D. P. (2007). International Law and Global Health: A Review of Compulsory Licensing and Public Health. Journal of International Affairs, 60(1), 71-88.

[14] Kremer, M., & Glennerster, R. (2004). A Market for Vaccines: The Role of Patent Pools. The Journal of Economic Perspectives, 18(2), 71-87.